

EY6
30:

SPEECH

OF

ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., Q.C.

S P E E C H
of
ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., Q.C.,

“THE OFFICE OF THE JUDGE PROMOTED BY
THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY
AGAINST WILLIAMS.”

Delivered on the 9th, 10th, and 11th of February, 1862.

(From the Notes of the Shorthand Writer.)

And

THE CRIMINAL ARTICLES AGAINST DR. R. WILLIAMS.



London:
SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, BROOK STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, W.

1862.

MAY it please your lordship, it now becomes my duty to offer to the Court some reasons why the objections which have been urged against the admissibility of these articles should not be considered valid in law.

My lord, it is right, perhaps, at the outset that I should state clearly the exact technical position in which the case is now placed. The main question is debated upon the admissibility of the articles in this case—a proceeding which resembles, though it is not identical, with a demurrer at common law. This circumstance, however, will give to the accused party an advantage which, as appearing for the Bishop of Salisbury, I by no means regret, the advantage of a reply.

My lord, the peculiar shape which these proceedings have taken is well known to your lordship and to those who practice in this Court, and, therefore, I only make this preliminary observation in order to prevent any mistake with respect to it being entertained elsewhere. Having made these observations as to the technical state of the case, I entirely agree with the opinion often vehemently urged upon your lordship, during the progress of this debate, as to the great importance of the issue. My lord, stripped of the technicality of the law, the real issue before your lordship may be stated in a very few words, for practically and substantially it is this—Is it competent to beneficed clergymen, with cure of souls, who have subscribed the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England—the whole object of which Articles and Formularies is to secure to the people of this country the teaching of God's Word, written to use the exact words of the Article—Is it competent to beneficed clergymen, by what they are pleased to call “remorseless criticism,” to dispose of all the prophecies of the Old Testament; and by what they are pleased to call a

“verifying faculty,” to deny all the miracles of the New? That, my lord, I say, stripped of its technicalities and of the cloud of verbiage which has been thrown over it, will be found to be the real issue which your lordship has to try; and it is one, the importance of which to the Church—so far as the establishment of it in this kingdom is concerned—I admit cannot be surpassed.

My lord, when I say this for fear of misunderstanding, let me not be supposed, for a moment, to express any doubt that the Church, apart from the question of the Establishment, will be uninjured, whatever may be the decision of this Court. I am old-fashioned enough to believe in what in this book is called “the fiction of an external revelation,” and I, therefore, am confident that God’s promises will be fulfilled to the Church. My alarm is not for her; my apprehension is for the establishment of that Church in this country; and I do entertain the most serious apprehensions that if your lordship should have been persuaded by the arguments which have been addressed to you to sanction such a work as this which is now before you, that the establishment will indeed be in great jeopardy. It will run great risk of being abandoned, not by one party in the Church or by another, but by that large class of the community—almost, I trust, universal—which believes in the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

My lord, my learned friend, Dr. Deane, who opened this case with all that temper, prudence, and wisdom which always characterizes his efforts in this and every other court, gave your lordship a sort of historical sketch of the proceedings which had led to the proceedings in this suit.

My lord, I must be permitted to fill up the outline of that sketch which was a little too barely stated by my learned friend. There are some figures which must be put into the foreground of that sketch, in order to do justice to the client for whom I have the honour to appear.

My lord, it is said that this volume of *Essays and Reviews*, which I now hold in my hand, was an innocent publication—a kind of closet speculation—which never would have obtained any notoriety or done any injury, if the Bishop of Salisbury had not instituted this suit against Dr. Williams. Some slight reference was made to the fact that an infidel review had hailed it as the greatest accession to this cause of infidelity which had appeared for a very long while. That infidel review—I call it by no name of unwarrantable opprobrium—I use the word infidel in the sense in which it uses itself—the *Westminster Review* denies altogether the authenticity of the Holy Scrip-

tures and the Doctrine of Revelation. In the 36th number of that work—the number for October, 1860—I find in a review upon what is called “Neo Christianity,” a highly enlogistic review of this work, *Essays and Reviews*. At page 294, are these words: “We speak of this book as a joint production, and not as a mere collection of essays; for such, notwithstanding its outward form, it undoubtedly is. We are quite aware that there is no formal connection in the argument; and we read in the preface that it has been written without concert or comparison.” At the bottom of that page the reviewer says: “If, again, we speak of this book as aggressive, we do so advisedly. No fair mind can close this volume without feeling it to be at bottom in direct antagonism to the whole system of popular belief. They profess, indeed, to come forward as defenders of the creeds against attacks from without, but their hardest blows fall not on the assaulting, but on the resisting, force. They throw themselves into the breach, but their principal care is to clear it from its oldest and stoutest defenders. In object, in spirit, and in method, in details no less than in general design, this book is incompatible with the religious belief of the mass of the Christian public, and the broad principles on which the Protestantism of Englishmen rests. The most elaborate reasoning, to prove that they are in harmony, can never be anything but futile, and ends in becoming insincere. All attempts to show that these opinions are in accordance with Scripture, the Articles, the Liturgy, or the Church, have little practical value, and do no small practical harm. Such reasoning may ease the conscience of troubled inquirers, but it is powerless to persuade the mass that that is, after all, the true meaning of that which they have been taught and have believed. Just as their instinct repudiated the ingenious attempts of the Tractarian writers to build a semi-Romish system on the dogmas of our Church, just so it will revolt from any attempt, however sincere, to graft the results and the principles of rationalism on the popular Christianity of the day. Is the crumbling edifice of orthodoxy to be supported by sweeping away the whole of its substructure, and Christian divines taught cheerfully to surrender all that the most exacting criticism assails? The mass of ordinary believers may well ask to be protected from such friends, as their worst and most dangerous enemies. Is it reasonable to suppose that, at this time of day, the Christian world will consent to reconsider the whole of its positions, to develope its cardinal doctrines into new forms, and to remodel the whole structure of belief upon

an improved theory? Will the complicated and time-worn mechanism bear so radical a repair? Can its pieces be reset and placed in new relations, and the rusted mediæval timepiece be restored into the shape of a new watch? Has it been all a mistaken rendering that men have been believing so long? Is theology then due to a mere confusion of terms? Can religion be set right by sounder canons of interpretation, and the mystery of the unknown cleared up by a more accurate scholarship? Of one thing we may be quite sure, that the public can never be persuaded to make trial of the process. They, at any rate, will never be brought to believe that the Bible is full of errors or rather untruths; that it does not contain authentic or even contemporary records of facts, and is a medley of late compilers; and yet, withal, remains the Book of Life, the great source of revealed truth, the standard of holiness, purity, and wisdom! Yet all this our essayists call upon them to admit in the very name of Revelation, and for the honour and glory of the Bible itself. Let our authors beware of such excessive candour, and rest assured that when the public once begin to read their Bibles in that spirit, they will soon cease to read them at all, and that the Hebrew Scriptures will take their place upon the bookshelf of the learned, beside the Arabian and Sanscrit poets. Nor, again, is it a more hopeful scheme to preach to the congregations in church and chapel, that the central notions of their creed, no less than the volume on which they are based, have been utterly misinterpreted and distorted; yet, withal, that the creeds must regain their influence under new forms, as the Scriptures, through their new expounders. The men and women around us are told that the whole scheme of salvation has to be entirely re-arranged and altered. Divine rewards and punishments, the Fall, original sin, the vicarious penalty, and salvation by faith are all, in the natural sense of the terms, repudiated as immoral delusions. Miracles, inspiration, and propheey, in their plain and natural sense, are denoumed as figments or exploded blunders. The Mosaic history dissolves into a mass of ill-digested legends, the Mosaic ritual into an Oriental system of priestercraft, and the Mosaic origin of the earth and man, sinks amidst the rubbish of rabbinical cosmogonies. And yet all this is done in the name of orthodoxy, and for the glory of Christian truth. Nay, unwearied with destroying this great edifice of old belief, our writers enter upon the gigantic and incredible enterprise of rebuilding the whole again from its foundations, upon the same ground plan, but with stronger walls; and after forcing the simple believer to unlearn his well

conned creed, they sit down to teach it to him anew, with altered words and remodelled phrases. An expurgated Bible resumes its place; miracles, inspiration, and prophecy reappear under the old names with new meanings; the harmonious whole arises anew in leftier and softer outlines with the cardinal features, with a revised atonement, a transcendental fall, a practical salvation, and an idealized damnation. What consolation can it be to the simple believer, to be told, that this inversion of his whole creed is all within the letter of the Articles, and the Liturgy, and the Scripture? All the bases of his creed are undermined, the whole external authority on which it rests is swept away; the mysterious book of truth fades into an old collection of poetry and legend; and the scheme of redemption in which he has been taught to live and die, turns out to be a demoralizing invention of men. And yet all this is done to him to strengthen his Christianity, to confirm him as a member of the Church, to give a moral power to his faith, to teach him the true spirit of the Gospel. It is done unto him not by the open foes with whom he has long waged unequal battle to the simple watchwords of 'no human reason,' 'the region of faith,' and so forth, but it is done unto him by doctors, professors and divines, by those who breed up churchmen and clergymen, by men who teach those who teach him and his children. We can well imagine the bitterness of heart with which he must repudiate this system of cure. His mental constitution cannot bear so terrific a remedy. They may demonstrate the scientific necessity of the operation they propose; but what if he feel certain of dying under their knives. Old and infirm as he is, they would restore him in a Medean caldron. Mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted hath lifted up his heel against me. We are quite aware that this purpose is not the conscious intention of the several writers in this book. It is quite possible that it may not be that of any one of them; but it most assuredly is the spirit of the book itself. We are dealing now not with the individual writers but with their book. We are quite aware of broad distinctions between them; some of them may shrink from going so far in the work of destruction, and some perhaps have no desire to go so far in reconstruction. But these seven authors are responsible for the book, and the book is responsible for the general impression it creates. Each workman may single out a separate portion of the whole edifice of orthodoxy, to undergo the process of demolition and repair; but he could hardly complain if the whole body are supposed to be together pulling down the whole. If one essay

in this volume repudiates any kind of miracle, another any kind of inspiration, another shows the Mosaic cosmogony to be an undisguised invention, and another deals with the Bible as Niebuhr dealt with Livy; is it too much to say that a book has appeared which at once repudiates miracles, inspiration, Mosaic history, and the authenticity of the Bible? Surely, too, these writers must know that is in theology that the catenary argument is so peculiarly untrustworthy. A chain of theological reasoning of all other chains is no stronger than its weakest part. What becomes of the Christian scheme when the origin of man is handed over to Mr. Darwin, and Adam and Eve take their seats beside Deucalion and Pyrrha? Of what use can it be to talk of Articles and Liturgy, or of creeds to a Protestant Church, which has been robbed of the written word from which they are all deduced?"

In a later part of the review, the writer goes through this particular essay of Dr. Williams's, which as I am about to argue upon it myself, I will not trouble the Court with. He says at page 310, "In short, the truth of the narrative, and the identity of the authors disappear together. It becomes a medley of legend, poetry, and oral tradition compiled, remodelled, and interpolated by a priestly order centuries after the times of its supposed authors. And this applies to the New Testament (though in a much less degree) just as to the Old. The process with which classical scholars are so familiar is renewsed. The bits of old songs or laws are skilfully picked out of the Pentateuch, which is shown to have been put together under the kings by the priesthood, who recast, and perhaps fraudulently invented whole books. The prophecies become sermons of every variety of spirit and purpose. The Psalms become a sort of Hebrew anthology of every possible merit and date. Thus the Old Testament is reduced to a very fragmentary and very untrustworthy collection of the literature of a certain Arab race. The grand spirit of Moses grows as dim in the dust of centuries as that of Numa Sinai moves us as little as the cave of Egeria. The primeval poems are distorted into prose by some college of Pontiffs or Augurs; and the war-songs of old heroes are hammered out into dreary narratives by the designing ingenuity of a caste. The process does not, of course, go so far with the New Testament, though it must suffer from the proximity of such a neighbour. The first three Gospels were put together from the floating and variable traditions of the Early Church, no man knows how or when. As much might be said for the 'Lives of the Saints.' The fourth Gospel, on which so much

is rested, is very late, and certainly not by St. John. Indeed, the only thoroughly authentic portion of the whole Scripture seems to be the Epistles—those of St. Paul, that is to say, for many of the others are very suspicious. In the writings of St. Paul, then, we do reach a firm point, of which author, date, and genuineness are certain; but even these, unfortunately, contain corrupt readings, and additions, or call them forgeries, on cardinal points made in the early days, when the Church was creating its theology.” Was ever a literature so provokingly unreliable? The mind wanders over the waste of waters like the dove seeking dry land. We listen for the true words of the great ones of old, but they strike a dull and confused utterance on the ear. Is this the book, or rather collection, which these writers place in the hands of every peasant and every child? Is this the world-wide source of life and truth—this the surest, noblest outgrowth of ages, and the volume that they consecrate for all time and all races. They answer, Yes; and they direct us to the sublime poetry of Isaiah, the touching love of the Gospel, and the noble devotion of St. Paul. The world will be in its dotage when these are undervalued or forgotten. But is this enough to consecrate the volume in which they are contained, where so much is uncertain, so much contradictory? Will the ignorant and the poor turn only to those pages, when they are told the others have so much less value? Will it be still Revelation to them, when they know not of what or whom Isaiah may be speaking, when they cannot be sure that they are reading the true words of Christ, and when the doctrines of St. Paul may possibly be spurious, and are comparatively unimportant? These writings will still be read, but in what sense will they remain an exclusive standard of belief, and a supreme guide of life. It is possible that had these books been first represented in this character as great but unequal works, they might have been thrust by habit into an exclusive respect, but having been once invested with a mystical sanctity, they must descend from their place of authority (if at all) to one even below their due rank. The mass break idols they no longer worship; they repudiate the guides in whom they had placed an extravagant trust. Our new teachers point out that their idol is but wood and stone, but wish them to retain it on the altar for its beauty and its age. They discredit the veracity of the oracles, and think mankind will still consult them for the poetry of the responses. These writers, indeed, seem utterly to misconceive the entire question. Their task is not to show that these writing have sublime beauties, teach

eternal truths, and are tolerably genuine, but to show why (not being mystical) and being so very unequal, and so utterly uncertain, they should take their place above all other writings, consecrated, canonized, and venerated. It is rather hard to have the Hebrew records shown to harmonize with the full stream of human thoughts, for the mere purpose of placing them over and outside the whole current of which they form part. We are asked to venerate the old prophets, not as seers, but as poets, and then are told to venerate no other poets like them. We are desired to see in the Jewish nation the purpose of ages moving onwards through their history, and then asked to ignore the purpose of ages moving through the history of far nobler and greater nations. It is not that Hebrew poetry is not great, but that Christian poetry is greater; it is not that there is nothing to be learned in the history of the Jews, but that there is more to be learned in the history of the Romans; or if any insist on the spiritual life of nations in the history of the Church. Man for man, race for race, the comparison is hardly possible, and Dante towers above Isaiah as much as St. Bernard above Samuel. If this be true, the maintenance of that race, and its literature in unnatural prominence under any pretence, or with any theory of interpretation, is an evil and a delusion. We do not want canons to interpret Scripture—we want to know what makes Scripture at all; we do not wish to learn how far or how little it agrees with science—we wish it to take the place that science shall assign to it. In the meantime, we desire that if the Bible, or any part of it, be returned as Holy Writ, it be defended as a miraculous gift to man, and not by distorting the principles of modern science. Let them be assured that there exists no middle course, that there is no inspiration more than natural, yet not supernatural, no theory of history agreeable to science, though not scientific; no theology which can abandon its doctrines and retain its authority. The position of Scripture either rests on external authority, or is a thorough perversion of a sound estimate of literature. The Bible can hold its place either by a divine sanction, or by glaring injustice to the other writings of mankind. The question is not whether, stripped of that sanction, it is worthless, but whether other books are not equally valuable. The fact is, that it retains its hold upon many cultivated minds by its literary power, but that by no means proves that it will do so with the uneducated mass to whom it has so long been an inscrutable law. In short, the plan is one which reduces the whole Bible to the position of the

“ Apoerypha.” The writer finishes this review by saying, “ Excellent theories of inspiration are given by our authors, with none of which are we much disposed to differ. Be it the highest utterance of mankind, or the teaching of God to man, through man’s heart and mind ; be it the guiding principle of human life, or the voice of the congregation, all these phrases used in their full and natural sense, express a reasonable and probably a sound theory. Such a theory, however, under no reading, can establish the position of Scripture. It rejects much in it, and it requires much beside it. It is not, moreover, a mere question as to the use of a particular book, we are not willing to quarrel about words. And some of our authors when talking of Scripture, may surrender the consecration, the authority, and even the exclusive use of it as a sacred book. That concession would hardly satisfy our want. The real evil would remain even if the book were not read daily in the congregations, and multiplied by the million. To teach in its spirit, to think in its ideas, to use its language, and to judge by its standard, is, we maintain, equally contradictory to a sound view of human history, and not much less injurious to the actual progress of society. This latter purpose at the very least, we think, our authors have avowed, and it is for this that we feel bound to ask all who are thoroughly free to think to reject their teaching. There is little use in denouncing bibliolatry, in order to encourage bibliology.”

Then it ends by expressing the gratitude which all persons who hold infidel opinions feel towards them—“ We have no desire to press this further, or to point to their distinctness upon Balaam’s ass, or the herd of swine, and their silence on more cardinal miracles. Be it enough that they repudiate all miraculous, supernatural, or arbitrary disturbance of the laws of nature.” It goes on to say, “ Science must determine on all facts ; criticism upon all events.” And at last it ends by saying, “ All honour to these writers for the boldness with which they have, at great risk, urged their opinions. But what is wanted is strength not merely to face the world, but to face one’s own conclusions. It is well to say what one really believes. It is better to believe what one really thinks. Even more necessary now than courage in act is honesty in thought. We need that rectitude and tenacity of mind which abhors to deceive itself ; and works out the issues of its reasoning without flinching and without fainting. We know the cost.”

This, my lord, that is a review to which my learned friend,

Dr. Deane, called your lordship's attention at the opening of his speech, in phrases of this description: he said there is an infidel publication which used the old maxim of persecution, ascribing to the authors opinions, and deducing from their premises conclusions, which they would not adopt themselves. It may be so, my lord, but that was the first impression made by the publication of this volume of *Essay and Reviews*, of which Dr. Williams' essay is one.

Now, the next historical event of any consequence upon this part of the case is, that there appeared also in a very well-known paper a letter from a most accomplished, highly educated man, unfortunately a professed deist, Mr. Francis Newman. He had rather a curious correspondence with the Brahma Tumaj, to whom he wrote this letter, the object of which appears to me to point out the growth of deism in England. He says, "England contains too great a mass of highly cultivated minds to be much influenced by any individual, whatever his goodness or his powers. No great results will be perceptible, until they are brought about from Parliament, from our universities, or from foreign reforms. These seem to me likely to act in sympathy. Seven of the most accomplished men in our universities have lately excited scandal by a book of essays, which thoroughly abandons all that used to be regarded as the strongholds of Christianity. The bishops have signed a paper, unanimously condemning the book. A cry is now raised, demanding that they will refute it. The controversy thus raised cannot stop here." That was the impression produced upon the mind of a most accomplished deist.

The next thing that happened was that this book was reprinted in America. How was it reprinted? Why, by a Unitarian minister; a professed Unitarian minister, who wrote an eulogy upon its contents.

My learned friend said something to your lordship also about the necessity of such a work as this, in order to draw back the men of Manchester and the manufacturing towns from their disbelief of the Bible. He said infidel societies were in the habit of pointing out to them the contradictions of the Bible; the impossibility of construing it with reference to the discoveries of modern science, and the great advantage that would result from the new form of belief opened by the publication of these *Essays and Reviews*. Now, what has really happened? These *Essays and Reviews* have been circulated, and are circulating while I am speaking, in the manufacturing towns, especially in Leeds. And how? At a very

cheap rate: each essay sold separately at a very cheap rate—I believe at a penny each. But by whom is that done? By professed infidel societies. They are circulating throughout the whole of our manufacturing districts at this moment. The virus and the poison which these books contain, intelligible or unintelligible, is at this moment being poured into the veins of the manufacturing artisans of this country, and yet my friend appeals to the advantage which the *Essays and Reviews* have conferred upon the true study of the Bible. Well, my lord, these things having taken place, I now come to another circumstance, which may be said to be one of mixed law and fact.

Dr. Deane.—I am very sorry to interrupt my friend. It is now my duty to say that in what my friend has been instructed to state he is entirely misinstructed in. The same report had come to our ears. I believe I am quite in order in saying this?

Dr. Phillimore.—Quite so.

Dr. Deane.—My friend makes his statement, and I am quite in order in making a counter-statement. The same report had come to our ears, and we have employed every possible means through our publishers, even to the employment of detectives to ascertain whether or not there have been any editions, or any garbled editions circulated, and we cannot find that a single edition has been circulated at Leeds or elsewhere, either of separate essays or of the whole book. It is entirely a misinstruction of my friend. We have taken every means to ascertain the truth, but we find there has been no such thing.

Dr. Phillimore.—I have not any doubt that my friend is right in saying the book itself has never been circulated—I never spoke of editions of the book; what I said was, that these *Essays and Reviews* had been circulated in a cheap form—sold at a penny a-piece, and sold to the artisans of Leeds and other towns.

Dr. Deane.—That is what I am instructed to contradict.

Dr. Phillimore.—Very well, we need not dispute about it.

Dr. Deane.—It must not go forth as an uncontradicted statement.

Dr. Phillimore.—It will go forth as a statement I make and you contradict. If my friend wishes further information on the subject, I can refer to a statement by a gentleman of high character (Mr. Munro), a clergyman who has been lecturing at Leeds. He distinctly stated, in an address he made the other day, “That the writers of *Essays and Reviews*

had, to his own personal knowledge, done more to swell the ranks of the secularists in Leeds than their best lecturers. Crowds listen to the lecturers while they point to that book as showing that even clergy of the Church of England are virtually secularists ; crowds buy the book ; and there are more copies of it in the secularist's lending library than of any other work published.

My lord, before my learned friend interrupted me, I was coming to a point which, in a case of ecclesiastical scandal, is one perhaps of mixed law and fact. I have adverted to the impression made on the public mind by the authors of this book, of whom six are ordained clergymen, I now call your attention to the conduct of the Bishops of the Church of England. The whole Episcopate of the Province of Canterbury met together, and in the language which I am about to read, they unanimously condemned this work. And what was the language in which they condemned it ? My friend said something about about the gentleman to whom the letter was addressed : of course it is wholly immaterial to whom the bishops communicated the decision at which they had arrived. That decision, which I hold in my hand, was conveyed in a letter signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans : " I have taken the opportunity of meeting many of my Episcopal brethren in London, to lay your address before them. They unanimously agree with me in expressing the pain it has given them, that any clergyman of our Church should have published such opinions as those concerning which you have addressed us. We cannot understand how these opinions can be held consistently with an honest subscription to the formularies of our Church, with many of the fundamental doctrines of which they appear to us essentially at variance. Whether the language in which these views is expressed is such as to make their publication an act which could be visited in the Ecclesiastical Courts, or to justify the Synodical condemnation of the book which contains them, is still under our gravest consideration. But our main hope is our reliance on the blessing of God in the continual and unceasing earnestness with which we trust that we and the clergy of the several dioceses may be enabled to teach and preach that good deposit of sound doctrine which our Church has received in its fulness, and which we pray that she may through God's grace ever set forth as the uncorrupted Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

To that instrument is appended the signature of every

suffragan bishop of the province of Canterbury ; and afterwards the province of York came to a similar resolution.

Now, my lord, I believe I am speaking with strict accuracy, when I say that never in the history of the English Church, certainly never since the Reformation, has there been a document which the unanimous censure of the Episcopate has been expressed upon a work written by a clergyman. My lord, in that Episcopate are to be found, as always must be the case in a Church founded upon the principles, upon which the Church of England rests, men of various opinions upon subordinate points. There are to be found among them men of the highest intellect, men of the greatest practical piety, and one, whom it is not altogether immaterial to observe, is an admirable German scholar, one who had been formerly the diocesan of Dr. Williams. Well, my lord, when we speak of living authorities, and when they are pressed upon the Court, in order to show by their writings what is the liberty of criticism allowed to clergymen upon religious subjects, it would be impossible to leave out of consideration the opinion of the United Episcopate of England. I say, as a mere matter of law, under the topic and head of authorities, it would be impossible to omit the mention of such a circumstance as that. And I go further ; I say it would be indecent, in the highest degree, to say that the Dean of the Arches—the official principal of the Archbishop of Canterbury—should have such an instrument as that placed before him on the subject of a book which is undergoing debate and investigation ; and to say that he is to set it aside, as in no way influencing him as to what is the law of the Church of England.

Well, my lord, rightly or wrongly, the unanimous Episcopate put forth that document ; and then what became the duty of the individual bishop within whose diocese one of these writers, so censured, had published his work ? It is said it was impolitic in the Bishop of Salisbury to proceed, that if he had left the book alone it would soon have died away ; that it was, after all, a mere speculation, without practical object or effect. My lord, among the many ornaments of the eloquence of my learned friend who spoke last—if he will allow me to call him my learned friend—was that he introduced a sort of rhetorical dialogue by way of informing the conscience of the Court, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*. Let me set a picture before the Court : The Bishop of Salisbury is sitting in his palace ; there comes to him a pious and honest parishioner of Broad Chalk. He says, “ My lord, I wish to speak to you on the subject of our vicar.” “ What is it you have to say ? ”

“ Why, my lord, he has been preaching some very strange doctrines ; it seems to me he has pretty well given up the Bible.” “ But how do you mean ? In what way ? ” “ Why, my lord, on Christmas Day he read to us that chapter (the 53rd Isaiah) which the Church of England, by her Liturgy, enjoins to be used ; and afterwards he preached a sermon in the pulpit, in which he said it had nothing whatever to do with our Lord ; that it was the work of a later Isaiah—it related to contemporary events. It was, I think he said, an exploded myth or some such strange expression ; and whether that was so or not, the advances of modern science would show that the Church was entirely mistaken in appropriating that particular lesson to the circumstances of our Saviour’s birth. Then there was a lesson read on the appointed day (Good Friday), about Abraham offering up his son Isaac. The Vicar read us the chapter in the regular way, and he afterwards preached a sermon in which he told us that when the Bible said God ordered Abraham to slay his son, it meant that the Devil ordered Abraham ; it was altogether a mistake to suppose that Abraham had really obeyed the voice of God in that severe trial of offering up his son : it was an entire mistake. In fact, he had opposed the voice of God, speaking through his own conscience ; and had ‘ mistaken the fierce ritual of Syria for the voice of God.’ My Lord Bishop, I said to the Vicar that these things were mentioned in the New Testament by our Lord and also by his Apostles, as being quite true ; and it puzzled us very much to know what we were to believe. He shook his head, and said something about a ‘ remorseless criticism ’ and ‘ a verifying faculty.’ I said, ‘ Well, sir, but we hear quite different doctrine in the adjoining parish.’ ‘ Oh, yes,’ he said, ‘ those are things the Church generally teaches ; but a great man, named Bunsen, has arisen, who has disposed of all those notions we used to entertain about the Old and New Testament.’ ” Suppose to that complaint the Bishop of Salisbury has said, “ I am very sorry for it, my good friend ; it is very bad what you tell me, but I cannot give you any redress. There is a great deal of uncertainty about the law, and it is also very expensive ; very likely the thing will die away—it is only a speculation.” “ But,” says the parishioner of Broad Chalk, “ What is to become of the cure of my soul, which your lordship has entrusted to this gentleman in the meantime ? I am very sorry, my lord, but if that is the state of discipline in the Church of England, I must take leave to go to the Wesleyan Dissenting Chapel on the right hand, or to the Roman Catholic Chapel on the left hand ;

because, much as they differ from me, and from each other, they both believe that the Bible is the Word of God."

Why, my lord, if the Bishop of Salisbury had made that answer to such a man, would he not have been liable to the severest condemnation that could have been cast upon him? Would he not have forgotten that most solemn obligation which, on the most solemn occasion, he had bound himself by, namely, at the time when he was consecrated a bishop—that he would drive away strange doctrines and heresies, God helping him, from his diocese. And would it not have been a matter for which he would have been liable to the censure, not only of the Church of England, but of every honest man to all time, if believing this document, which he, with the other bishops had so signed—believing that this essay was not consistent with an honest subscription to the Articles, he had, nevertheless, left this gentleman with the cure of souls in a parish in his diocese? My lord, whatever the result of this investigation may be, I, for one, am satisfied that the Bishop of Salisbury has done simply his bare duty in bringing the matter into this Court; and that the more this act of his is reflected upon, the more it will be seen to be the only one which—I will not say a bishop of the Church of England—but which any honest man, with his obligations, could take.

My lord, I have ventured to be thus long in these preliminary remarks; which are, after all, but an answer to those with which my friend opened his case. I have ventured to be thus long, contrary to my usual habit; thinking that I was entitled, from the great peculiarity of the case, and the great sensation which it has excited, not only in this Court, but throughout the land, to put fairly before the Court and before the public, the position in which the Bishop of Salisbury was placed, with regard to the Rev. Dr. Williams, the Vicar of Broad Chalk—a parish in his diocese.

Now, my lord, having made these preliminary observations, I come to that part of the case which, I confess, is more properly addressed to a court of justice. I come to consider by what law the Court could consider the admissibility of these Articles? And I apprehend the sources of that law are to be found in the common ecclesiastical law or canon law, in the canons of 1603, in the Articles, in the Liturgy, including the Ordination Service, and including particular portions of Scripture selected for particular days, and from the interpretation which has been put upon all those sources of law by decided cases, and by what must be applied to all of them—namely, by

the reason of the thing, reference being had to the language and to the subjects of the different essays.

Dean of the Arches.—Let me understand you, Dr. Phillimore. How far do you say it is competent for the Court to take cognizance of Scripture in this case?

Dr. Phillimore.—If your lordship will permit me, I am coming to that presently as a distinct branch of my argument. I only state now, generally, that those are the sources from which, I think, the law should be drawn; and before I have finished with the exposition of those general principles, I will deal with the question your lordship puts to me—viz., How far the Court is entitled to take cognizance of the Scriptures themselves.

Dean of the Arches.—I do not wish to interrupt you on any account whatever, but it is a matter of such extreme importance, and, in my judgment, of such great difficulty, that I wish to draw your attention to it most particularly; and also, with reference to that question, to all that passed in the Gorham Case, and the judgment of the Privy Council therein. I also wish to direct your attention to this, whether it be competent to the Court to confine its attention to the particular parts of the Scriptures which are cited in the argument; and at the same time not to go into the consideration of the rest of the Bible? And whether the inevitable effect of that will not be that the Court will be called upon to decide questions of divinity, and not simply a question of a judicial nature—viz., whether certain given books or articles are, or are not, repugnant to the Articles of Religion, the Canons of the Church, and the Liturgy itself? Now I pray you to address your attention to that question with all the powers of which you are master.

Dr. Phillimore.—I am very much indebted to the Court for the clearness of its statement, and I can assure the Court the objection itself has been one greatly considered by us before the articles were given into the Court, and one upon which I am prepared to state to the Court presently the whole of the reasons which induced us to give in those articles.

Dean of the Arches.—I hope I have not interrupted you.

Dr. Phillimore.—Not in the least, but as it will come in rather more conveniently for my argument a short time hence—

Dean of the Arches.—At any time you please—

Dr. Phillimore.—With your lordship's permission I will go on in the order I have pointed out.

The first authority to which your lordship's attention has

been drawn, is the thirty-sixth canon, which your lordship knows is the Canon of Subscription, still I had better read it again: “No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor either by institution or collation admitted to any ecclesiastical living, nor suffered to preach, to catechise, or to be a lecturer or reader of divinity in either university, or in any cathedral or collegiate church, city, or market-town, parish church, chapel, or in any other place within this realm, except he be licensed in either by the archbishop, or by the bishop of the diocese, where he is to be placed, under their hands and seals, or by one of the two universities under their seal likewise; and except he shall first subscribe to these three articles following, in such manner and sort as we have here appointed.” The first is as to the Supremacy, which I need not read.

“II. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed, in public prayer, and administration of the saeraaments, and none other. III. That he alloweth the book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred and sixty-two; and that he acknowledgeth all and every the articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God.

“To these three articles whosoever will subscribe, he shall, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz., ‘I. N. N., do willingly and *ex anima* subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.’ And if any bishop shall ordain, admit, or exercise any, as is aforesaid, except he first have subscribed in manner and form as here we have appointed, he shall be suspended from giving of orders and licenses to preach, for the space of twelve months. But if either of the universities shall offend therein, we leave them to the danger of the law, and his majesty’s censure.”

Now, what is the meaning of “willingly and *ex animo*” subscribing these articles for the avoiding of all ambiguities? My lord, it is always of great importance that this canon should receive a definite construction, and one that is adhered to by the Court, whatever cases may come before it. It is obvious that upon the construction of this canon may mainly

depend the fidelity or infidelity of clergymen to their solemn obligations. And, my lord, I am the more disposed to draw your especial attention to it in the special case of these essays and reviews, because I see a distinct endeavour traceable in another essay of this book to avoid that obligation in what I consider a most dishonest manner.

This matter of subscription was very much debated and considered in the early portion of this century in a very remarkable way. There were a body of persons in holy orders at that time, who had persuaded themselves that they could hold Arian doctrines, and could nevertheless continue to subscribe to the Articles of the Church of England. There was a famous case of Dr. Clarke, who, I believe, was at that time rector of St. James's, who was delated before the Covocation, if I may use the expression. The Court will find the whole report of it in Cardwell's *Synodalia*. He was delated for using certain Arian language, but he made a recantation, which was accepted. That case led to a very able publication by Dr. Waterland, called, *The Case of the Arian Subscription Considered*, which your lordship will find in the second volume of Waterland's works by Van Mildert. There are one or two passages which I think bear upon my present argument, to which I wish to draw the attention of the Court. In page 284 he says, "I shall have no occasion to say anything in defence of our excellent Church, as to her requiring subscription; and requiring it according to her own sense of Holy Scripture. This part of the controversy has been judiciously cleared and settled by two very ingenious writers: Mr. Stebbing in his *Rational Enquiry*, and Mr. Rogers in his *Discourse and Review*. My business is only to begin where they end, and to show that, as the Church requires subscription to her own interpretation of Scripture, so the subscriber is bound, in virtue of his subscription, to that, and that only, and if he knowingly subscribes in any sense contrary to, or different from, the sense of imposers, he prevaricates, and commits a fraud in so doing. This is a cause of some moment—it is the cause of plainness and security, in opposition to wiles and subtleties. It is in defence, not so much of revealed, as of natural religion; not of the fundamentals of faith, but of the principles of moral honesty: and every heresy in morality is of more pernicious consequence than heresies in points of positive religion. The security and honour of our Church are deeply concerned in this question. As to its security, everybody sees what I mean; and as to the honour or reputation of our Church abroad, whenever we have been charged with

Socinianism, or Popery, or any other monstrous doerines, we had no defence so ready at hand, or so just and satisfactory as this; that our subscriptions were sufficient to wipe off all slander and calumny. The good of the State, as well as of the Church, is likewise concerned in this question; because there can be no security against men's putting their own private senses upon the public laws, oaths, injunctions, &c., in contradiction to the sense of the imposers, if these principles about Church subscription should ever prevail amongst us.” That is one passage. Then there is another passage at page 335, in which the learned writer says, “I shall now briefly sum up the particulars of what has been advanced above, for the reader's clear apprehending of it as well as the better retaining it. The Church of England requires subscription, not to words, but things, to propositions contained in her public forms. Subscribers are obliged, not to silence or peace only, but to a serious belief of what they subscribe to. Subscribers must believe it true in that particular sense which the Church intended (so far as that sense may be known), for the Church can expect no less; the design being to preserve one uniform tenor of faith, to preclude ‘diversity of opinions,’ to have her own explications, and none other (as to points determined), taught and inculcated; and to tie men up from spreading or receiving doctrines contrary to the public determinations. These and the like ends cannot be at all answered by subscription, unless the subscriber give his assent to the Church's forms in the Church's sense, that is, in the sense of the compilers and imposers. The sense of the compilers and imposers is to be judged of from the plain, usual, and literal signification of words, and from their intention, purpose, or design, however known: the rule for understanding the public forms being the same as for understanding oaths, laws, injunctions, or any other forms or writings whatever. When either the words themselves, or the intention (much more when both) is plain and evident; there the sense of the imposers is fully known, and there is no room left for a subscriber (as such) to put any contrary or different sense upon the public forms. If words be capable of several meanings, but yet certainly exclude this or that particular meaning.” I shall have occasion to press this upon your lordship in another part of my argument. “A subscriber cannot honestly take the forms in that meaning which is specially excluded. For this would be subserbing against the sense of the Church, at the same time that he professes his agreement with it.” Then he goes on to what does not bear upon this—applying that to the Arian doctrines,

“The subscription therefore of those gentlemen, however glossed over with the pretence of subscribing” in such sense as is agreeable to what they call Scripture, really amounts to no more than subscribing, “so far as is in their opinion agreeable to Scripture,” which way of subscribing not only defeats every end of subscription, and stands condemned by our laws, and by the express resolution of our judges, but is also absurd in itself; as leaving room for any prevarication whatever, in the matter of oaths or tests; and for subscribing the Romish confession, or even the Aleoran, or anything, and is, moreover, explicitly condemned, even by the generality of those who plead for Arian subscription.” Then having gone through (what I need not trouble your lordship with) a disquisition upon the Creeds, Articles and Liturgy, and says a page 344, “Having shown that Creeds, Articles, and Liturgy must all come in, to determine in our present question, I would now proceed to cite passages from our public forms, and confront them with select sentences drawn from the writings of the new sect, that every common reader (for to such I now write) may have ocular demonstration of the truth of what I affirm, that the expressions of our public forms are special, precise, and determinate against the new scheme; not general or indefinite as this writer wishes, I can hardly say believes. But I must first take notice of a remark which he has at page the 8th, that we are obliged to subscribe only the English articles, not the Latin. I know not what uses he intends by it, though he intimates there may be some; keeping upon the reserve as usual, when he suspects an advantage may be taken. Dr. Clarke, to do him justice, openly declared what evasions or salvos he had to justify his subscribing. He considered, I suppose, that, without this, it would be subscribing with mental reservations which is perfect Jesuitism. But this writer perhaps thinks there is no harm in it, but that it is an innocent practice, and that so long as he can but invent some secret evasion to himself, he need have no concern about satisfying the world. To return to the matter in hand. As to the Articles, English and Latin, I may just observe for the sake of such readers as are less acquainted with these things, first, that the Articles were passed, recorded, and ratified in the year 1562, and in Latin only. Secondly, that those Latin Articles were revised and corrected by the Convocation of 1571. Thirdly, that an authentic English translation was then made of the Latin Articles by the same Convocation, and the Latin and English adjusted as nearly as possible. Fourthly, that the articles thus perfected in both languages

were published the same year, and by the Royal authority. Fifthly, subscription was required the same year to the English Articles, called the Articles of 1562, by the famous Act of the 13th of Elizabeth. These things considered, I might justly say with Bishop Burnet, that the Latin and English are both equal authentical." I read these passages in case the Court should think anything turns upon the construction of one or other of the Articles.

My lord, that was Waterland's opinion upon Arian subscription. Now, my lord, there is a Bishop Conybeare, who wrote upon this subject (I cite from a book called Randolph's *Euchiridion*, which I have no doubt the Court has seen and read), it is volume iii. The passage I am about to quote from, is page 240. "One thing yet remained in order to the full state of this subject, and that is to consider what is implied in the subscription itself; whether it expresses our assent to the truth of the Articles subscribed, or be only an engagement not to dispute or contradict them, I conceive it will appear by what I am about to offer, that our subscription amounts to an approbation of, and assent to the truth of the doctrines subscribed. And that first, because this seems to be implied in the bare act of subscribing, and we should be understood by every indifferent spectator, as approving the truth of those doctrines, unless the form of subscription declares the contrary, nor would any one be apt to consider them as articles of peace, but as articles of doctrine. This notion is farther confirmed by the very title of the articles themselves; for they are said to be framed for the avoiding diversities of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion; but this end cannot be obtained, unless they are subscribed as truths assented to. What hath been here said, will receive greater weight from considering the declaration in the 36th Canon, in which we acknowledge all the thirty-nine Articles to be agreeable to the Word of God; and consequently to the truths, which we expressly receive, and not barely doctrines not to be opposed. Lastly, let it be remembered, that the reason why the clergy in particular are required to subscribe is this, because they are teachers. The articles therefore, must be supposed to contain doctrines to be taught and inculcated on the people, and concerning which, it is not sufficient in a teacher to be silent; were the case otherwise, it would follow that the people are only guarded against the errors of their pastors, but not entitled to any assistance from them. But if teachers are to explain and recommend these doctrines, then a subscription to them must imply a belief of them; unless it

be maintained, that it is reasonable to recommend as true what in our opinions we condemn as false."

My learned friend who spoke last, speaking on another point, referred also to a passage in a work of very high authority of its kind, though not exactly a legal authority. He referred to the very memorable debate which took place, I think, in 1775, when a very famous application was made to Parliament by certain clergymen of the Church of England, to be released from the obligation of their subscriptions.

Dean of the Arches.—When was that?

Dr. Phillimore.—In 1772, the petition was presented. There is a very edifying commentary to be found on the subject, I must say, in the speech of a person whom my learned friend most rightly eulogised in the speech of Mr. Burke on that occasion.

It will be found, my lord, in the usual edition of his works, in the beginning of the 10th volume. It is a fragmentary speech. It is clearly the notes of what he had written out to speak; whether he had spoken it I do not know. Nothing can be more convincing than it is. It is a speech on the act of uniformity.

Dean of the Arches.—Is it stated there, Dr. Philimore, that that passage from Burke was on the occasion of 1772.

Dr. Phillimore.—I will read, your lordship, the speech. "On the petition which was presented to the House of Commons from certain clergymen of the Church of England, and from certain of the two professions of civil law and physic, and others; praying to be relieved from subscription to the thirty-nine Articles as required by the act of uniformity." Then there is the note: "The persons associated for this purpose, were distinguished at the time by the name of 'The Feathers Tavern Association,' from the place where their meetings were usually held. Their petition was presented on the 6th of February, 1772; and on a motion that it should be brought up, the same was negatived on a division, in which Mr. Burke voted in the majority, by two hundred and seventeen against seventy one." So it must have been at the same.

Dean of the Arches.—The reason I asked was this—there was a subsequent petition.

Dr. Phillimore.—I was not aware of it. My learned friend read a passage in which Mr. Burke ridiculed the idea of there being any security in a subscription to the Bible, and said that the Bible was composed of a great variety of documents, so to speak; some were in the poetry, some written at one time and some written at another, and people might draw their own

conclusions, and you would come to no uniformity at all from such a subscription. He says, in a passage to which, I think, my learned friend referred, “Therefore, to ascertain Scripture, you must have one article more, and you must define what that Scripture is which you mean to teach. There are, I believe, very few who, when Scripture is so ascertained, do not see the absolute necessity of knowing what general doctrine a man draws from it before he is sent down authorised by the state to teach it as pure doctrine, and receive a tenth of the produce of our lands. The Scripture is no one summary of doctrines regularly digested, in which a man could not mistake his way; it is a most venerable, but most multifarious, collection of the records of the Divine economy.” But, my lord, he had said before, and in these notes of his speech he had pointed out that there was no hardship whatever which justified this application to Parliament. He said, page 10: “These gentlemen complained of hardships. No considerable number shows discontent. But in order to give satisfaction to any number of respectable men, who come in so decent and constitutional a mode before us, let us examine a little what that hardship is. They want to be preferred clergymen in the Church of England, as by law established, but their consciences will not suffer them to conform to the doctrines and practices of that church.” That is, they wanted to be teachers in a church to which they did not belong. It is an odd sort of hardship. They want to receive the emoluments appropriated for teaching one set of doctrines whilst they are teaching another. “A church, in any legal sense, is only a certain system of religious doctrines and practices, fixed and ascertained by some law; by the difference of which laws, different churches (as different commonwealths) are made in various parts of the world.” Well now, my lord, this followed in the ineffectual attempt of the Arians to get rid of the subscriptions by a construction of their own. It followed upon it. And, therefore, I think it again very clearly shows the necessity of putting a straightforward, honest meaning on what is meant by Inspiration.

My lord, this question was much discussed, as your lordship may remember, in Mr. Oakley’s case, the Archdeacon of Taunton’s case, and Mr. Heath’s case; and, I have no doubt, they will be fresh in your lordship’s recollection. There is a passage in Hardwicke’s Articles, chap. 11, page 314, which I may mention. Your lordship will find a good deal of the historical part of the case set down, but I only mention it for this reason, that it is a very convenient summary of the

different attempts which had been made, from time to time, to get rid of subscriptions, either by an appeal to Parliament or by the less honest way of putting a false construction on plain words. The writer says, at page 229, some words which, I think, may be read as bearing on the present case: “The following period in the history of religion was undisturbed by any organised attack upon the Articles”—that is, after this petition—“or indeed upon any of the texts of doctrine put forth by the English Church; for, in spite of the coldness which prevailed at the close of the last century, and in spite also of a number of individuals, and the later theories of subscription which are perpetually recurring, the Formularies of Faith have continued to keep their hold upon the affections of the country, and to answer the salutary end for which they were first provided. In our own age there is, perhaps, less fear than ever that the Articles of Religion will be successfully assailed by the growing host of unbelievers. The new life which has sprung up in the hearts of individual churchmen, and has propagated itself through the masses of the island to the farthest dependencies of our gigantic empire, is awakening, together with a deeper zeal and a more unworldly self-renumeration, a fresh love for the objective verities of religion, and a cordial regard for the teaching of the past.”

My lord, the question of the meaning of the subscriptions to the Articles extends itself further, when the Court has to consider what the meaning is of the expression in the Ordination Service, which we have had so much discussion about, “I unfeignedly believe the Holy Scriptures.” The argument upon the one naturally connects itself with the argument on the other.

I take now, my lord, the “Ordering of Deacons.” The bishop says, “Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?” *A.*—“I do believe them.” *Bishop.*—“Will you diligently read the same unto the people assembled in the church where you shall be appointed to serve?” *A.*—“I will.” Now, an argument of great ingenuity, but what I may call terrible import, was addressed to the Court upon this subject—and it is one to which I venture humbly to think the attention of the Court can hardly be too much directed. What do you mean when you say you unfeignedly believe the canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament? Why, any plain man would answer the question very readily. I am quite certain you would not ask one man out of a hundred, taking men of average understanding and average honesty, who would not say, “I mean

to say the Bible is the inspired word of God.” Everybody would say that is the meaning of unfeignedly believing the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which is another way of saying the same thing. But it is said that a person may honestly make that statement of unfeignedly believing them, and yet at the same time may believe that several parts of the canonical Scriptures are not Holy Scripture in any sense of the word at all—that is to say, that they are human compositions entirely—that an undue reverence has been ascribed to them by ignorance and prejudice, which undue reverence the light of modern science has dispelled, and that it would provoke a smile to talk about the personality of Jonah, for instance, or many other similar cases which might be put; and, therefore, that when you say you unfeignedly believe the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, you are perfectly at liberty to say, at the same time, “I reject this, that, and the other, from the category of inspired books.” Well, but when you press a person upon that point, and endeavour to show that such a statement is really to trifle with the plain sense of language, and to destroy the foundation of all trust between man and man, then there is a very singular argument adopted, which my learned friend behind me used with great ingenuity, and it is this—and I never heard one to which I listened with more amazement—“Oh, yes, I unfeignedly believe the Old and the New Testament, but where are they? Not in your authorised version—that is not the Old and New Testament. I believe the Old and the New Testament, in the originals, wherever they are to be found, and I am sure I do not know where that is nor anybody else.” That is the argument—I do not do my learned friend any injustice—that is the deliberate argument which my learned friend uses. So that when the bishop gives the Bible to the ordained deacon, as he does afterwards, as your lordship is aware, “Then the bishop shall deliver to every one of them the New Testament, saying so and so.” So that when the bishop delivers the authorised version to the deacon—having previously secured his unfeigned assent to that Bible—he goes through a farce neither more nor less. It is a complete mockery. The form should be altered. The form should be, “Do you unfeignedly believe the original Scriptures, whatever they are, and wherever they are to be found, and wherever you find them?” I do not exaggerate the case in the least. That is what the question should be if it is to be answered, as it has been answered, in the debate on this case. My lord, I say that, on the face of it, that is utterly and entirely de-

structive of all uniformity of worship throughout the kingdom. What is to prevent any clergyman saying, "The authorised version says God tempted Abraham to offer up Isaac, but the true version, wherever it is, agrees with Baron Bunsen, and says that Moloch tempted Abraham to offer up Isaac, and Abraham disobeyed the voice of God in his conscience in so doing." I am not exaggerating. That is the argument in the very essay before you. Now look a little at the consequences. If one portion of the authorised version may be got rid of by the Vicar of Broadchall, what is to prevent any other clergyman exercising that much eulogised license, and getting rid of any other portion whatever of the Scripture? Because it is not the mere reading of the Scripture, if it may be afterwards accompanied by a comment which destroys its effect, which is the teaching which the Church of England or any other Church in the world requires. It would be an idle waste of breath to argue that you cannot obey the article in the letter, and disobey it in the spirit directly afterwards. You cannot teach by reading authorised versions to the people, and then unteach by showing, in a sermon, that it ought to have no effect upon them.

Let me now a little consider what the dry law may be in the matter.

What is the law as to the authorized version of the Bible?

There is a canon, as your lordship is aware, ordering "a volume of the largest Bible to be in every church. That is one of the canons of 1603. It is the 80th canon." The churchwardens or questmen of every church and chaple shall, at the charge of the parish, provide the Book of Common Prayer, lately explained in some few points by his Majesty's authority, according to the laws, and his Highness's prerogative in that behalf, and that with all convenient speed, but at the furthest within two months after the publishing of these our constitutions. And if any parishes be yet unfurnished of the Bible of the largest volume, or of the Books of Homilies, allowed by authority, the said churchwardens shall within convenient time, provide the same at the like charge of the parish." Of course, my lord, it is quite obvious that that does not refer to the present version, and for the best of all reasons, that the present version was not then in existence. That referred to Queen Elizabeth's Bible.

I must draw your lordship's attention a little to the history of the original version. My lord, you will find prefaced to Mant's Bible, a very convenient summary of the history of

the versions. I will state to your lordship the outline of them.

The first of our English Bibles was what is sometimes called Tyndall's Bible, though it was really done by Coverdale. It is a very curious piece of history, that though there were two or three Bibles in the time of Henry the Eighth, there was no new version of the Bible at all during the seven years of Edward the Sixth, that is, no Bible by royal authority, and a very remarkable fact that is. I need not say anything about Queen Mary's reign. There was during that time a Geneva Bible published. Then there was in Queen Elizabeth's time, what is called the Bishop's Bible, a bible prepared by Archbishop Parker, and some of the bishops. That was the Bible to which the canon referred, "the Bible of the largest volume." Then there came the present authorised version, which is, as the Court probably knows, James the First's version. That was provided by the labours of no less than forty-seven of the most distinguished Hebrew, Greek, and Latin scholars of the time. Mant, says, "this is the translation of the Holy Scriptures now in common use amongst us, and since that time there has been no authorised version of any part of the sacred volume. The excellency of it is such as might be expected from the judicious care with which it was conducted, and the joint labours of the many distinguished men employed upon it." That, therefore, is the version which is now read in all the churches, and if one looks to the authority of it, a somewhat difficult point, it must have been by an exercise of the royal prerogative originally. It must have been one of those prerogatives claimed by the Crown after the abolition of the Papal power in this country.

No doubt even existed, or was ever mooted, as to the power of the Crown to order the translation to be made, and it was universally accepted. But it remained without legislative authority, so to speak, if such legislative authority was necessary, until the Act of Uniformity. Then observe what effect the Act of Uniformity had upon it. The act made the Prayer Book a part of the statute law of the land, and the Prayer Book incorporated in it the whole of the Bible, or very nearly the whole of the Bible, by the order of its service, and by the order for the day. Therefore, take it which way you will, I think the argument cannot be shaken, that the authorised version of the Bible is that which is binding on all persons to read in the churches. Then, my lord, how does that affect the position that you may nevertheless profess your belief in what is substantially a different Bible. For

does it not come to that, if when you are asked to make that solemn statement, that you unfeignedly believe the Old and the New Scriptures, and you do it at the time with a mental reservation, that you do not mean that particular translation which represents the Old and New Scriptures in your country, but you are referring to something else which you have never seen, are you not evading palpably and plainly the obligation under which you have laid yourself? It seems to me with great deference, that this is an argument which has been used for the first time in my recollection in any court of justice of civil or ecclesiastical law, and it is an argument which has been forced upon those who use it, by the impossibility of reconciling the doctrines which they teach with the authorised version of the Bible. It is an argument therefore, which I submit to your lordships, legally, morally, and religiously, entirely falls to the ground. If any protection is to be sought, if any shelter is to be found for opinions which would not be otherwise legal by saying, as has been attempted to be said during this argument, I am not contravening the Bible because I contravene the authorised version, then I submit that it is certainly not in the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that such an argument can be listened to, or that it can be allowed the least weight.

Now, my lord, I will deal before I go any further (because it connects itself with the last head of argument which I used), with the position for which I contend, viz., that certain selections of Holy Scripture which are to be found in the Prayer Book, are properly pleaded in these articles.

Let me draw your lordship's attention to the manner in which these selections are set out, because of course whatever decision your lordship may come to, it will apply to all the articles of charge. It will not be necessary to repeat the argument in every article. I offer now one argument on the principle of admitting them at all. We will take the first: The first article of charge, or what may be called the first, which sets out any passages from the Book itself, begins in number at the seventh, and at the top of page 3, it sets out three passages, one from page 60-1, one from page 82-3, and another from page 77-8. For the present, I do not read those passages. Having set out these passages, it, according to the decision of the Lords of the Privy Council, in *Burder v. Heath*, proceeds to set forth, to summarise, if I may use the expression, in a short statement, the heresy which we aver is contained in these passages. Having done that, it says, "We object to you, that you did advisedly maintain or affirm, that the Bible or Holy Scripture

is an expression of devout reason, and the written voice of the congregation, not the Word of God, nor containing any special revelation of His truth, or of His dealings with mankind, nor the rule of our faith ; or that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm doctrines, positions, or opinions, to that or to the like purport and effect, and that the said doctrines, positions, or opinions, are contrary to, or inconsistent with the sixth, seventh, and twentieth of the said Articles of religion, and contrary to and inconsistent with that part of the Nicene Creed which declares in substance that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets, and contrary to and inconsistent with the teaching of the Church." Now, we come to the point : " As contained in that portion of Holy Scripture appointed in the said Book of Common Prayer, to be read as the Epistle for Christmas day, which is in the words and figures following, to wit—"The Epistle, Hebrews, i., 1. God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Then it sets out the rest of that Epistle. Then it sets out an Epistle which is ordered to be read on the Feast of the Epiphany (Ephesians, iii., 1). " For this cause, I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles ; if ye have heard of the dispensation of the Grace of God, which is given me to you-ward : How by that revelation he made known unto me the mystery." And then comes these words, " As I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and prophets by the Spirit." And then it sets out the Collect. Therefore, upon that article is raised that question to which your lordship has drawn my attention. First of all, let me clear my way by saying, that I presume your lordship's question does not extend, neither does the objection extend to the collect itself ? I presume there can be no doubt about that ? It is not disputable or disputed, the collect itself may be referred to.

Dean of the Arches.—As far as my own opinion goes, you are perfectly at liberty to refer to the collect.

Dr. Phillimore.—That seems to me a very great step in the argument. The collect I should submit to your lordship is so called because it is a collection of certain propositions deduced from the Holy Scripture, applicable to that day, and put into the form of a prayer.

Now comes the question, whether a court of justice—to put

it quite plainly—can say this, “Inasmuch as the Church of England has said that two portions of Scripture should be read on particular days, which portions of Scripture contain distinct denials of the doctrine which you have preached.” I am entitled to assume that, my lord, for the sake of argument, “therefore your doctrine is not according to the Church of England.” Now, I am perfectly aware, my lord, that it is the first time on which such a plea has been introduced into a criminal proceeding in this court. I admit it, my lord. It was done advisedly by my learned friends and myself, after great consideration.

The course of argument which led us to that conclusion I venture now to lay before your lordship, before I support it by authorities. This is the only court (excepting, of course, the diocesan courts—this court being possessed by Letters of Request from the Bishop of Salisbury of the case) in this country in which any heresy or spiritual offences, so to speak, by the clergy, can be tried. I pass by, for the present, the consideration of whether convocation has or has not lost a power, which—as your lordship is aware—at the beginning of the last century eminent judges thought it still possessed, not only of denouncing a book, but of trying the individual writer. I pass by the consideration, for the present, whether, if that power did exist, the 3rd and 4th Victoria has not by necessary implication taken it away? I think I may assume that I am not embarrassed in the present instance, with that consideration in my first position, viz., that this is the only court in which spiritual offences can, subject of course to an appeal, be tried. That may be according to each person’s opinion a very wise or a very unwise, a very hard or a very fair state of things towards the clergy and the laity; but I am not now concerned with that, I am dealing with the fact that so it is. But it would be a tremendous proposition to say that the only court in the kingdom which can take cognizance of an offence which is charged as a denial by a clerk of Holy Writ is by its forms of pleading and decisions incapacitated from receiving the best evidence of the mind of the Church on the most important subject.

The Thirty-nine Articles themselves must admit the reference to Holy Scripture sometimes, because it is manifest (and I do not think that position was denied by your lordship in the Denison case)—it is manifest—that if terms of Scripture are used, you may have recourse to Scripture to explain those terms. Well, but if it should turn out on examination that these “lessons” were the main teaching of the Church, if it

should turn out that when the new Prayer Book was substituted for the mass book, after the most deliberate consideration, the great reformers of that day put these very lessons into the Prayer Book, in order that they might be able to say when assailed, "there is the doctrine of the Church of England," and if an Act of Parliament has made the Prayer Book, which contains these lessons, a part of a statute, what authority has the Court for saying, "this part of the Prayer Book I will read, and that part of the Prayer Book I will not read?" Where does the Act of Uniformity draw any distinction between the lessons specially appointed for the day, and the collect for the day?

Where does the Court find its principle, which induces it to say, "The collect I will look at, but at the chapter referring to Isaiah, liii, I will not look, pointed out as it is especially by the Church, because it was predictive of our Saviour's birth—ordered to be read on that day, the clergyman being amenable to be articled against and punished, if he did not read it—to be deprived if he persisted in not reading it, which is the fact can the Court say I must shut my eyes to this writing, and my ears to the argument that this portion of Scripture was inserted to show that the Church considered Isaiah, liii, chapter, predictive of our Lord.

My lord, I can only say, that if such be the result, it is one which would go very far to establish this proposition—that there are direct offences against the doctrine of the Church of England for which there is no tribunal in the kingdom to which they are amenable. Of course it would be a very different thing if the constitution in its wisdom had said, "up to a certain point the court of law shall try, after that point the archbishops or bishops, or the bishops' assessors shall try," but if it has not said that you are absolutely reduced to this proposition, which with great respect be it said, approaches almost to absurdity, that by an accident here is an Ecclesiastical Court which cannot derive its knowledge of the doctrine of the Church of England from a portion of that Prayer Book which an Act of Parliament established, though it is shown that that portion was put into the Prayer Book for the express purpose of teaching the doctrine. I think that is a very dangerous, and, with reverence be it said, an absurd position.

Now, my lord, before I go further upon this head, I will just show the Court *quo animo*, at all events, (according to the best authorities) these lessons were made part of the Prayer Book. There is fortunately the best authority on this point, and that is the authority of the person who advised the intro-

dition of these lessons—I refer to Bishop Cosin. That learned and excellent prelate has left some valuable notes on the Prayer Book, which have been recently reprinted. I will refer to authorities on this point, if my statement is questioned; but, for the sake of not wasting unprofitably the time of the Court, I make the statement now: Bishop Cosin, was one of those who were employed by Convocation to draw up the Prayer Book before it was submitted to the legislature. I am speaking now of the last Prayer Book of 1662. Bishop Cosin had before that time a great deal to do with the other Prayer Book with writing notes upon it, and preparing it, and so on. The book to which I now refer, the Court will find in the fifth volume of his works, published in a work called *Library of Anglo Catholic Theology*. It contains notes on the Book of Common Prayer, by John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. In page 189, he is speaking of the “proper lessons.” The Court must put some interpretation on the word “proper lessons.” Proper for what? Proper for inculcating the history and the doctrine of the special festivals to which they refer, he says “Whitsunday, First Lesson at Evensong Wisdom i., which is appointed to be read, in regard of these words that are contained in that chapter, ‘Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum, &c.’ which is the introit in the order of Sarum for this festival Monday in Easter week, at morning prayer, Exodus, xvi. This lesson is appointed to be read in reference to the Saerament of the Eucharist at this time of Easter generally celebrated, whereof the manna was a type, and wherein the words of the Psalmist are verified, Portas cœli orperuit Dominus et fluit illis manna panem cœli dedit eis, panem angelorum manducavit homo. Psalm lxxxiii., 25, 26. There is the like reason for the appointment of the first lesson of Evensong, Exodus, xvii., concerning the water of the rock, a type of the blood of Christ, whereof we drink in that Sacrament, 1 Corinthians, x. And they all drank of the same spiritual rock, and that rock was Christ. Psalm lxxxi., 16. And he fed them with honey out of the stony rock. Good meditations there upon the Sacrament that we receive at Easter Monday, in Whitsun week, Genesis, xi. Upon Whitsun eve they wont (by the order of Sarum)—your lordship knows the Salisbury Missal was the one which laid the foundation chiefly of the Prayer Book)—“to say this prayer in the Church of England “Præsta quæsumus Domine ut gentium facta dispersio divisione linguarum ad unam confessionem Tui nonnis cœlesti munere congregetur per Dominum nostrum, &c., and from hence was this lesson appointed to be read.” That is one of the passages at page

190, he gives the proper psalm for Ascension-day, chosen chiefly for these words contained in the psalm—"Thou art gone up on high, Thou hast led captivity captive." I should say these notes are divided into three categories: there was the first series of notes in the Book of Common Prayer of 1619, there was the second series in the book of 1838, and a third series in the manuscript, and now, in page 247, he speaks of the epistles and gospels generally upon the principle of their admission, and he uses what I consider very remarkable words, showing how they followed antiquity where it had not been corrupted by Rome in the composition of the Prayer Book. He says, "Post haec commentaria apostolorum et scripta prophetarum legentur. Just. Mart. Vocab haec Tertullianus fomenta fidei, ab interlectione Scripturarum." Then there follow these words, "Ex quo praeterea liquet lectiones eas e Scripturâ sumptas que tempori congruerent." Thus these portions of Scripture were selected which suited the particular occasion. Then follows, at the bottom of that page, "Justissimis causis veteres christiani commentaria de rebus Christi (quae ad explicandam illustrandam et confirmandam doctrinam a Christo communiciatam pertinent," and so forth. Whatever the value of it may be, here is a distinct statement that the selections are made for what purpose? To illustrate, to explain, to confirm the doctrine. They therefore must be evidence of that doctrine. At page 420, there is another and rather important passage concerning Daniel, xiii. Your lordship knows one of these very charges is connected with the denial of the predictive element in Daniel. "In October, concerning the 6th of Exodus; in November, concerning the 26th and 24th chapters of Ecclesiasticus, come from the order of King James and his bishop upon the exceptions taken by the Puritans against the lessons formally appointed by law in the conference at Hampton Court."

Now, I appeal to this statement as very strong historical evidence, that the lessons were inserted in the Prayer Book, as directly conveying doctrine. They were objected to by the Puritans when the matter was arranged. Some were rejected, some were retained; and retained and rejected on what ground? On the ground that they contained the teaching of the Church. "Wherupon," says Cosin, "we have now that proclamation set at the beginning of this book, which before his time we had not; neither was it lawful to make any alterations in the Liturgy, but by the whole Convocation and Parliament, as it should seem by the Act of Uniformity. Then there is, at

page 422, Proper Lessons on the Sundays, as in the Act of Uniformity it is appointed, with one alteration or addition of certain lessons, to be used in every Sunday in the year. For, in the former edition of this book, there were no proper lessons set, but only for the high festivals and holydays. And that they were employed to make this alteration, seem not to have been mindful of a clause in the preface (which they suffered to stand there still), when is faulted the very same thing that is here now ordered—as the book of *Essay* to begin in Advent, and the book of *Genesis* in *Septuagesima*.” It is sufficient for me to show the author’s view, and why the lessons are put in. I need not go into detail. There is another passage to the same effect, at page 503.

My next reference is to Bishop Comber, who is also a very great authority on the Prayer Book. I do not believe he was on the Committee of Convocation, but he was one of those who took a very active part in the preparation of the Prayer Book, and his book is called *A Companion to the Temple, or a Help to Devotion in the daily use of the Common Prayer*. It is a well-known book. I am quoting from the edition of 1679, vol. I, page 232. He is speaking upon the lessons, and he says, “The Church hath done her part in compliance with the designs of God’s mercy and providence,” and so forth. Then he says, “And lest any should pretend ignorance, the Governors and Lights of the Church have carefully translated the Original Scripture into all languages, that every nation might hear in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. (Acts, ii., 11.) After which pattern our Church hath made that elaborate, exact, and faithful translation into the English tongue, the like to which is not in any nation. And now the Scripture truth learned our language, that it may instinct us in our own words; and it must be wilful negligence if we do not understand it; to prevent which, we are enjoined to hear or read it every day, both at morning and at evening prayer, according to the practice of the Jews, who read the law in their synagogues, however, on the Sabbath, and on other days they staled no food till they had read a section of it either in public or private; and every man knows how solemnly and constantly this hath ever been done in all the assemblies of the Christian Church. For hence they confirmed their opinions in doctrine, and learned lessons, in holiness, in conversation. I had rather your own observation should inform you, than spend time to tell you how carefully this church hath selected the most practical and pertinent chapters—

omitting the more difficult, or rather remitting them, to private consideration when you have more leisure. The lessons suited to the solemn festivals are determined, and do either explain the mystery, relate the history, or apply the example unto us." They were chosen for no other object, to teach the doctrine of the Church. They were sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity, and were put in for that very purpose, to explain the mystery, relate the history, or apply the examination of the Holy Writ; and, my lord, their aim would be entirely defeated, if it was competent for a clergyman of the Church of England to say this, "I may read Isaiah, liii., as predictive of our Lord, in the lessons; I may preach against it in the evening or in the morning." Where would be the doctrine of the Church of England if that could be holden? You would be establishing it on the one hand, and throwing it down with the other. If it be true that these portions of Scripture were selected for the purpose of teaching the doctrine of explaining the mystery, may you say then, "These, I know, were put into the Prayer Book to show that the prophecy applied to our Lord; but I will dispute it, and show it did not, and you shall not punish me in any ecclesiastical court, because you cannot cite that part of the Prayer Book which contains the selection put in for the purpose of teaching the doctrine."

I will now refer your lordship to Wheatley—no mean authority on the Book of Common Prayer—pages 124-6. "Of the Lessons," he says, "our hearts being now raised up to God in praising and admiring Him in the Psalms, we are in a fit temper and disposition to hear what He shall speak to us by His Word. And thus to a respite or intermission is given to the bent of our minds; for, whereas, they were required to be active in the Psalms, it is sufficient, if in the Lessons, they hold themselves attentive. And, therefore, now follow two chapters of the Bible—one out of the Old Testament, the other out of the New—to show the harmony between the law and the Gospel; for what is the law but the Gospel foreshowed? What the Gospel, but the law fulfilled? These are exactly the points in issue in the present case.

That which lies in the Old Testament, as under a shadow, is in the New brought out into the open sun; things there prefigured, are here performed. And for this reason the first lesson is taken out of the Old Testament, the second out of the New; so that the minds of the hearers may be gradually led from darker revelations to clearer views, and prepared by the vails of the law to bear the light breaking forth in the Gospel. He then has a section showing the antiquity of the

practices of the lessons. He has another section—Section 3—on the uses of the lessons, and shows why some were admitted and some selected. “Very many chapters in Ezekiel are omitted, upon account of the mystical visions in which they are wrapt up. Why some others are omitted, does not so plainly appear, though, doubtless, the compilers of our Liturgy thought there was sufficient reason for it. After all, the canonical books of the Old Testament are read through (except Isaiah ; which, being the most evangelical prophet, and containing the clearest prophecies of Christ, is not read in the order it stands in the Bible, but reserved to be read a little before and in Advent, to prepare in us a true faith in the mystery of Christ’s incarnation and birth, the commemoration of which at that time draws nigh).” My lord, I ask, as a matter of common reason, can any court reject this argument, even if the Court thinks it could not look at the contents of the chapter of Isaiah? can it resist the argument, proved abundantly upon proper evidence, that that chapter of Isaiah was put in as predictive of our Lord—that it was taken out of its usual course in the Bible, and put in as connected with the collect of Advent (which your lordship is of opinion can be used)—taken, advisedly, out of its own place in the Bible, and inserted into this particular place in the Prayer Book? Wheatley goes on in the next paragraph as follows: “In conformity to so general a practice, the Church of England still continues the use of these books in her public service ; though not with any design to lessen the authority of canonical Scripture.” Well, that is about the Apocryphal books. He says then, “Nor is there any one Sunday in the whole year that has any of its lessons taken out of the Apocrypha.” He then says, “The course of the first lessons appointed for Sundays, is different from that which is ordained for the weekdays. For from Advent Sunday to Septuagesima Sunday, some particular chapters out of Isaiah are appointed for the aforesaid reason. But upon Septuagesima Sunday, Genesis is begun, because then begins the time of penance and mortification, to which Genesis suits best, as treating of the original of our misery by the fall of Adam, and of God’s severe judgment upon the world for sin. For which reason, the reading of this book was affixed to Lent, even in the primitive ages of the Church. Then are read forward the books as they lie in order ; not all the books, but (because more people can attend the public worship of God upon Sundays than upon other days) such particular chapters are selected as are judged most

edifying to all that are present. And if any Sunday be (as some call it) a privileged day—*i.e.*, if it hath the history of it expressed in Scripture—such as Easter Day, Whit Sunday, &c.—then are peculiar and proper lessons appointed.”

Archbishop Secker wrote an *Explanation and Defence of the English Liturgy*.

The edition I am citing from is an old one of 1792, but I do not know that there is a more recent one. It is volume iii., of his works, page 32: he says, “then we offer up the collect for the day, of which I have spoken already, and after it, read two portions of Scripture, to which it hath frequently a reference. One of them is usually taken from the Epistles, the other always from the Gospels. The Epistle hath been thus read certainly for 1,300 years, but the Gospel much longer. And the very portions that we now use, were most of them used on the same days, 1,200 years ago, and perhaps a great deal earlier. The annual course of them, and of the collects prefixed to them, began then, as it doth now, not with the civil year, or the entrance of the sun into this or that sign; but from the advent, the approach of the appearance of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. And it was so contrived, that the former part from his birth to his ascension, should represent to us the principal articles of history, the latter those of our own duty.” That is in volume iii. There is a passage in volume ii. It is a sermon on the reliance on the Spirit of God. It is volume ii., page 622. “The order in which the books of both Testaments are read, is that in which they stand. Only in the Old, the prophet Isaiah, containing the fullest predictions of Christ’s coming and kingdom is placed at the approach of his nativity; and in the New, the Gospels and Aets are the lessons for the morning, and the Epistles for the afternoon. In this manner we make provision for every day in the year; and hence one great recommendation of daily attendance on public prayers (when there are opportunities for it), is that by means of it we shall proceed regularly through the sacred writings, and preserve the due connection of the several discoveries made in them to man. But for the first lessons on Sundays, those chapters of the Old Testament are selected, which appeared to be most useful. The second lessons being from the New, there was no necessity, and little room for choice. And to holidays, such portions of both are adopted as best agreed with the occasion.”

I refer also to a passage in Jeremy Taylor’s *Holy Living and Dying*, chapter iv., section 1, towards the end of the

eighth paragraph. “The wisdom of the Church of God is very remarkable in appointing festivals or holy days, whose solemnities and offices have no other speial business but to record the article of the day, such as Trinity Sunday, Ascension, Easter, Christmas Day; and to those persons who can only believe, not prove or dispute, there is no better instrument to cause the remembrance and plain notion, and to endear the affection and hearty assent to the article, than the proclaiming and recommending it, by the festivity and joy of a holy day.” And in the same book, section 6, paragraphs 9 and 10, “What the Church hath done in the Article of the Resurrection, she hath in some measure done in the other articles in the Nativity of the Ascension, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost; and so great blessings deserve an anniversary solemnity, since he is a very unthankful person that does not very often record them in the whole year, and esteem them the ground of his hopes, the object of his faith, the comfort of his troubles, and the great effluxes of the Divine Mercy greater than all the victories over our temporal enemies, for which all glad persons usually give thanks. And if with great reason the memory of the Resurrection does return solemnly every week, it is but reason the other should return once a year. To which I add, that the commemoration of the articles of our creed in solemn days and offices, is a very excellent instrument to convey and imprint the sense and memory of it upon the spirits of the most ignorant person. For as a picture may with more fancy convey a story to a man, than a plain narrative either in word or writing; so a real representment, and an office of remembrance, and a day to declare it, is far more impressive than a picture, or any other art of making and fixing imagery.” He ends by saying, “The memory of the saints are precious to God, and therefore they ought also to be so to us; and such persons who serve God by holy living, industrious preaching, and religious dying, ought to have their names preserved in honour, and God be glorified in them; and their doctrines and lives published and imitated; and we by so doing, give testimony of the communion of saints.” There is one more passage from Jeremy Taylor. It is taken from the preface to the apology for authorised and set forms of Liturgy, section 37. (It is Heber’s edition, volume vii., page 303.) He says, “Certain it is, that there is no part of religion, as it is a distinct virtue, and is to be exercised by interior acts and forms of worship, but is in the offices of the Church of England.” Then he goes on, and

says, “When the revolution of the anniversary calls on us to perform our duty of special meditation and thankfulness to God for the glorious benefits of Christ’s incarnation, nativity, passion, resurrection, and ascension (blessings which do as well deserve a day of thanksgiving, as any other temporal advantage, though it be the pleasure of a victory), then we have the offices of Christmas, the Annunciation, Easter, and Ascension.”

Now, my lord, these are the authorities which I have selected from others, that might be quoted to prove this proposition, that the Church had a distinct object and meaning in choosing certain portions of Scripture for certain great historical and scriptural events. She had, as the object of her teaching, the actual truth of these events, and also the spiritual meaning in them, and the Act of Uniformity authorised the lessons proper for holy days, and certain days. The fact of that being so, cannot be withdrawn from the contemplation of the Court; the Court therefore cannot refuse to take cognizance that for certain holy days, certain lessons were appointed. I am now, my lord, arguing it not with respect to the general selections of Scripture for the whole year round, but upon the lesser ground of certain holidays having certain proper lessons appointed to them, and it seems to me, that if the Court were of opinion that it could not look into the lessons which, so to speak, are not called “proper,” but which are a mere division of the Bible, so as to cause it to be read somehow or another throughout the whole year, that a different consideration would apply to the duty of the Court with respect to selected lessons. Proper Lessons, as they are called, but I should have a right to say the Court must put a construction on these words “Proper Lessons,” that construction must be, that they were proper for a particular event celebrated on that day. It was proper that Isaiah liii. should be read on Good Friday, as predictive of our Lord, and if that was proper, it must be highly improper in a clergyman to deny that there is any prediction whatever of our Lord in Isaiah liii. I do not know that I can press the argument further, and I am afraid it does not have great weight with your lordship.

Dean of the Arches.—I beg you to understand, Dr. Phillimore, that I have given no opinion on it. I say it is a very difficult question with reference to the judgment of the Gorham case.

Dr. Phillimore.—I am obliged to your lordship for reminding me. I will say a word with regard to the Gorham case.

I am now reading from a very accurate report of the Gorham case, in the *Notes of Cases*, vol. vii., page 482

Dean of the Arches.—It is the part of it, Dr. Phillimore, in which the Privy Council talk of open questions. That is the passage more particularly. You understand distinctly, I give no opinion on this question whatsoever.

Dr. Phillimore.—The passage is, “ And if it were supposed that all points of doctrine were decided by the Church of England, the law could not consider any point as left doubtful. The application of the law, or of the doctrine of the Church of England to any theological question which arose, must be the subject of decision, and the decision would be governed by the construction of the terms in which the doctrine of the Church is expressed, viz., the construction which, on the whole, would seem most likely to be right. But if the case be, as undoubtedly it is, that in the Church of England many points of theological doctrine have not been decided, then the first and great question which arises in such cases as the present, is whether the disputed point is, or was meant to be settled at all, or whether it is left open for each member of the Church to decide for himself according to his own conscientious opinion. If there be any doctrine on which the Articles are silent, or ambiguously expressed, so as to be capable of two meanings, we must suppose that it was intended to leave that doctrine to private judgment, unless the Rubries and Formularies clearly and distinctly decide it. If they do, we must conclude that the doctrine so decided is the doctrine of the Church. But, on the other hand, if the expressions used in the Rubries and Formularies are ambiguous, it is not meant to be concluded that the Church meant to establish indirectly as a doctrine, that which it did not establish directly as such by the articles of faith, the code avowedly made for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishment of consent touching true religion. We must proceed, therefore, with the freedom which the administration of the law requires, to examine the Articles and the Prayer Book, for the purpose of discovering what it is, if anything, which, by the law of England, or the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, is declared as to the matter now in question.” My lord, the difficulty which would arise in your lordship’s mind, would be from this, from their having used the words “ Rubries” and “ Formularies” only in the former part of what I have read, for they go on to say, that they must exempt the Articles in the Prayer Book. I think I need not tell your lordship, and I believe I am accu-

rate in saying so, that no question of this kind was raised before the Privy Council. The contention that the doctrines might be derived from proper lessons appointed by the Prayer Book apart from the Bible generally, was not raised in the Gorham case before the Privy Council, to the best of my belief. It does not appear that there was any decision on that particular point throughout the judgment—that is, to the best of my belief. One argument occupied an octavo volume, and I cannot say it was not there; but, to the best of my belief, that particular point of law, being deducible from Proper Lessons selected by the Prayer Book for particular festivals, was not raised; and therefore it cannot be considered, I think, that the case of Gorham against the Bishop of Exeter is a decision one way or other on this point. I think Courts are in the habit of saying, “that point was not brought before us, and when we use expressions like the ‘Formularies’ and the ‘Rubrie,’ and afterwards use the word Prayer Book *in extenso*, that will not bind our hands at all with regard to an argument hereafter to be brought before us, that inference was to be drawn from the Selection and from the Proper Lessons.” The Rubrie would rather come in aid than otherwise. The “Lessons proper for the Holydays” would strictly be within the Rubrical definition. They would be set out, and are set out, as proper for Holydays by the Rubrie itself, and by the Formularies. And then the question would be—whether, when you take the one example which I have insisted upon (the Isaiah liii.) the Proper Lessons for Good Friday—must a court of law stop there, and not say what that Proper Lesson contains?

Dean of the Arches.—It is a question of immense difficulty, and the consequences are such as are quite alarming. I say again, I give no opinion till I have given it the deepest consideration in my power; but I do not at present see if I admit the whole of this to be read—the Lesson that is cited here—how can I exclude from consideration in this case any part of the whole Bible, which the other side may think fit to bring in, in illustration of the doctrine therein contained. The Court will then be in this position, and a fearful position it is even to think of for a moment—not to decide a judicial question of whether the doctrine laid down by Dr. Williams is conformable to the Articles, or to the Prayer Book, comparing one with the other, but whether it is conformable to the extracts from the Bible, and to the whole Bible bearing on these extracts. Where I am to put the limit, where I am to shut the door on that argument, at present I do not see. You

must feel, I am sure, as I feel, the extreme difficulty of embarking on such a voyage.

Dr. Phillimore.—Yes, my lord, I do feel it strongly; and if I thought my position necessarily led to the bringing in the whole Bible, so to speak, into controversy before your lordship, I should argue it with less confidence than I do; but it does not appear to me to be necessarily attended with that result, because the answer would, with great submission, be this—I put it in as few words as possible: “ You say there is no prediction of Our Saviour in Isaiah, liii. ?—*A.* There is not. Prove it as to that particular chapter selected for Good Friday. —*A.* That is no proof; I will show you other parts of the Bible which say it is not so.” Then I think the door is shut against that, because the answer will be, “ Show me, from other portions of Scripture selected, that Isaiah, liii., was not intended to contain a prediction of Our Lord, and you may do so because you are within the range of the Prayer Book. I will mention besides this consideration, though it increases perhaps the legal difficulty of the case. I have been appealing to the portions appointed to be read in the Bible, not directly set out *in extenso* in the Prayer Book, but ordered to be read. Supposing it is a Gospel or an Epistle, by what authority can the Court refuse to look at the Gospel and the Epistle, which is part of the Prayer Book, and which is part of the statute? Is there any argument which might exclude a reference to the Old Testament generally, and would not extend to the case where the portion was actually in the Prayer Book itself set out?

That would be another of the difficulties which surround the subject no doubt, but it would be a very difficult position legally to maintain. Here is a book which the statute says I must read. I will read as far as the Collect, and there I will stop.

No, I say, I beg your lordship’s pardon—you must go on, and read what follows the Collects. Where can you find any authority for reading one part of a statute and not reading the other part?

Dean of the Arches.—That is the very difficulty, Dr. Phillimore; because nearly the whole of the Bible, with the exception of Leviticus and part of the Apocalypse, is ordered to be read on certain days.

Dr. Phillimore.—It is remarkable that portions were excluded upon the express ground that they were not edifying to the common people, and therefore they were not put in. I

may observe, in passing, that the particular difficulty which your lordship is supposed to be subject to about Bell and the Dragon is wholly immaterial, because Bell and the Dragon, in the Apocrypha, is not one of the portions appointed to be read.

Dean of the Arches.—We will leave that out.

Dr. Phillimore.—And it is another reason that the Apocrypha could never be used for the purpose, because the terms of the Article exclude it at once, therefore it is not to be used in the proof of doctrine.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen.—I explained that if the Church reads that or anything else, it is some intimation of the Church's intention.

Dr. Phillimore.—As far as the Apocrypha is concerned, that, of course, could not be used; the terms of the sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles itself shut it out. Subject to the assistance which I shall derive from my learned friend's own confirmation of this argument, I am not prepared with any other authorities, or any other reasons, beyond those that I have taken the liberty of urging at some length upon the Court.

Dean of the Arches.—You have done perfect justice to your client, Dr. Phillimore, and you have assisted the Court very materially.

Dr. Phillimore.—I am very much obliged to your lordship for saying so.

I have said thus much, my lord, upon the question of the admissibility of those selections of Scripture into the Articles of Clergy. It becomes me now to condescend, as they would say in Scotland, upon the Articles themselves, and to offer a defence for them. But, before I do so, there are some general observations as to certain general positions which have been advanced upon the other side, which I had better dispose of now.

My lord, it has been said very often that the object of this prosecution is really to stifle discussion, to put an end to criticism and examination of the Scriptures. I think the expression was “to prevent the clergy from using their minds.” It is an opposition to reason, it is said. To that, my lord, we have one answer—that reason, and what is in these days called rationalism, are totally distinct things. The highest exercise of reason—we think in common with the greatest thinkers in this country—is to know where reason must be silent, and bow before Revelation. But in order, my lord,

that the prosecutor may not be represented, as he has been, as a person, the object of whose prosecution is really to prevent the clergy of this country from fairly arguing all matters that may come before them, which are consistent within the limits which the law has imposed ; and in order to put it in the best light before the Court, instead of using my own language, I would refer the Court to the language of a very great man, and one whom I rather think the Court itself is familiar with —namely, the language of Bishop Horsley, who certainly was not only a very great divine, but a most accomplished scholar, in every sense of the word ; a great rhetorician, and a great logician. He preached a very remarkable sermon upon this subject (his fourteenth sermon) in the cathedral church of Gloucester, at a public ordination of priests and deacons ; and he took this very subject for his discussion, and he took a text from the Epistle to the Corinthians, “ For I have determined to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.” And in my edition, vol. 1, page 198, Bishop Horsley used these expressions, which I would crave leave to borrow for the occasion: “ This sketch of the characters of the false teachers in the Corinthian Church, and the sort of doctrine which they taught, is the key to the Apostle’s meaning in many passages of this Epistle, in which, as in the text, he may seem to speak with disparagement of wisdom, learning, and eloquence, as qualifications of little significance in a preacher of the Gospel, and as instruments unfit to be employed in the service of Divine truth. In all these passages, a particular reference is intended to the arrogant pretensions of the false teachers, to their affected learning and counterfeit wisdom. It was not that, in the Apostle’s judgment, there is any real opposition between the truths of revelation and the principles of reason, or that a man’s proficiencey in knowledge can be in itself an obstacle in the way of his conversion to the Christian faith, or that an ignorant man can be qualified to be a teacher of the Christian religion, which are the strange conclusions which ignorance and enthusiasm, in these latter ages, have drawn from the Apostle’s words ; but he justly reprobates the folly of that pretended wisdom which, instead of taking the light of revelation for its guide, would interpret the doctrines of revelation by the previous discoveries of human reason. And he censures the ignorance of that learning which imagines that the nature of the self-existent being, and the principles of his moral government of the world, are in such sort the object of human knowledge,

as like the motions of the planets or the properties of light, to be open to scientific investigation ; and he means to express how little is the amount, and how light the authority, of the utmost wisdom that may be acquired in the schools of human learning in comparison of that illumination which was imparted to him by the immediate influence of the Divine Spirit, the fountain of truth and knowledge on his mind.” My lord, that sermon was preached upon the occasion of the Ordination of Priests and Deacons ; and I believe it contains exactly the Bishop of Salisbury’s opinion upon the question of what has been called the use of reason by the clergy, in the criticism and examination of the Scriptures.

My lord, something was said to your lordship, I think, in the course of the argument, by my learned friend ; I remember something was said that you were to sit here more as a judge of criticism than as a judge of law. My lord, we are not contending in any way whatever—in no one fragment of these articles can it be found that we have ever put forward the position, either directly or indirectly, that the fullest criticism, and that the most unfettered use of reason, may not be applied to understanding the oracles of God ; but what we have said in substance is this—that if, under the mask of criticism, and under the garb of interpreting the Gospels, you arrive at conclusions and publish conclusions which are wholly inconsistent with the Doctrines and Formularies of your Church, then you ought to leave your office in that church. It matters not by what road you have arrived at them—whether you call it criticism or whether you call it interpretation—if they have brought you to the conclusion that the doctrines of your Church are false, then you ought to leave that Church in good faith, remembering the terms of your subscription. There is a passage to which, I think, I need only refer in passing, in vol. 2 of Van Mildert’s *Sermons on the Boyle Lecture*, at page 164, in which he puts forth an answer to Toland. And a remarkable circumstance it is, and I shall presently be obliged to call your lordship’s attention to it, that most of the arguments which are to be found in this volume are identical with those which are to be found in Tindall, and Chubb, and Woolston, and all the exploded trash of the deists of the beginning of the last century. My learned friend said something about somebody having written an article in the *Quarterly Review*, wondering at the novelty of these doctrines. Certainly, if the writer did so, he was an exceedingly ill-informed person, for there is not

one single position there that has not, from the time of Porphyry down to the time of Woolston, been asserted over and over again by heretics who have opposed the sound doctrine and teaching of the Church. Van Mildert was opposing Toland, and he said, “What then says the unbeliever?” and he quotes Toland’s *Christianity not Mysterious*. But what then, says the unbeliever, is the property of reason? is it altogether useless, or are we to be precluded from using it in these most important of all concerns for their security against error.”

(The argument was practically adopted by my learned friend yesterday.) “Our answer is, that we do not lessen either the utility or the dignity of human reason by thus confirming the exercise of it within those natural boundaries which the Creator himself had assigned to it. We admit, with the deist, that ‘reason is the foundation of all certitude;’ and we admit, therefore, that it is fully competent to judge of the credibility of anything which is proposed to it as a Divine revelation; but we deny that it has a right to dispute (because we maintain that it has not the ability to disprove) the wisdom or the truth of those things which revelation proposes to its acceptance. Reason is to judge whether those things be indeed so revealed, and this judgment it is to form from the evidence to that effect. In this respect it is the foundation of certitude, because it enables us to ascertain the fact that God hath spoken to us. But this fact once established, the credibility—nay, the certainty of the things revealed—follows as of necessary consequence: since no deduction of reason can be more indubitable than this, that whatever God reveals must be true. Here, then, the authority of reason ceases. Its judgment is finally determined by the fact of the revelation itself; and it has thenceforth nothing to do but to believe and to obey.” And, my lord, I say once and for all, that if this Dr. Williams, who is the Vicar of Broad Chalk, had been an unbeneficed clergyman, without a cure of souls, it might have been within the Bishop of Salisbury’s duty to have simply said to him what the great Bentley said to his predecessor (from whom he has borrowed so much without acknowledgment), to this very deist, Collins, “I hope that this gentleman who, by the little smattering of his learning and his great self-conceit, has lost his religion, may find it again by a harder study and a humbler mind.”

I wish to make one general remark here, applicable to all the authorities which were cited upon the other side, and I do this with strict reference to the law. It is repre-

sented, and within certain limits it is no doubt truly represented, that your lordship and the Privy Council have both holden that where there is reasonable doubt as to the construction of the terms of an Article, the fact that eminent divines have holden a certain opinion without being blamed for it, lets in the liberty, if I may use the expression of a clergyman, and within certain bounds, and with certain reasonable qualifications, no doubt that may be said to be a proposition of law. I call your lordship's attention, with reference to that remark to this observation of mine. In all the long catalogue of authorities which were cited to you on the four former days, not one single authority professed the opinions which are laid down in this Essay. The system adopted was, as I shall show in detail, to set up a great name, to cite a great work, to prove that a particular opinion had been entertained by that person—not the opinion of the Essayist, and then to argue that if he might entertain that opinion, the Essayist might maintain his. But I may venture to draw your lordship's attention to the fact that a solitary position which a clerk might advance without being blamed, certainly without being prosecuted, in four or five volumes, in the rest of which there was nothing whatever to cavil at, is a very different thing from publishing an Essay in which almost every position is reprehensible, and the object of which is obviously to undermine the doctrines of the Church. I call your lordship's attention, so far as the authorities were cited, to this single observation, namely, that they do not bring the case within the shelter which was given by Burder and Heath, and the Gorham case. They were, if I may use the expression, authorities set up to be knocked down.

Now, my lord, there were three, and most remarkable they were, which were produced as containing opinions approximating to those of Dr. Williams. What are the authors to them? The one was a Nonconformist, the other was a Presbyterian, and the other was a Plymouth Brother. One was Dr. Chalmers, of whom I am sure I would wish to speak, as every educated man must speak, with great admiration; but he is no authority whatever for a question of the doctrine of the Church of England, for he belonged to Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and it would be as idle to press our Thirty-nine Articles upon him as to press his Westminster confession on us. He is clearly no authority on a question of doctrine. The other was Baxter, who refused altogether, as Mant will tell you if you look at his Preface of the Common Prayer Book, to have anything to do with the compilation of

the Common Prayer Book, and broke off his connection with the Commission because he insisted upon pressing his opinions, which were utterly at variance with those of the Church of England upon certain points. You will find that matter stated at length in the Preface to Mant on the Common Prayer Book, and I will just show your lordship the exact words upon that point. At page 5 of the Introduction, he says, “These Commissioners had several meetings at the Savoy, but to very little purpose; the Presbyterians heaped together all the old scruples that the Puritans had for above one hundred years been raising against the Liturgy, and, as if they were not enough, swelling the number of them with many new ones of their own. To these, one and all, they demanded compliance on the Church side, and would hear of no contradiction even in the minutest circumstances. But the completest piece of assurance was the behaviour of Baxter, who (though the King’s Commission gave them no farther power than of comparing the Common Prayer Book with the most ancient Liturgies that have been used in the Church in the most primitive and purest times, requiring them to avoid as much as possible all unnecessary alterations of the forms and Liturgy wherewith the people were altogether acquainted, and had so long received in the Church of England) would not so much as allow that our Liturgy was capable of amendments, but confidently pretended to compose a new one of his own, without any regard to any other Liturgy whatsoever, either modern or ancient, which, together with the rest of the Commissioners on the Presbyterian side, he offered to the Bishops to be received and established in the room of the Liturgy. Such usage as this we may reasonably think must draw down the disdain and contempt of all who were concerned for the Church, so that the conference broke up without anything done, except that some particular alterations were proposed.” Baxter, therefore, is not a very good authority to cite on a question of the doctrine of the Church of England. And who is the other? Why Dr. Tregelles, who is a Plymouth Brother.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen.—I quoted him as being opposed to Dr. Williams.

Dr. Phillimore.—He is a Plymouth Brother, and why I know it, I must tell my learned friend, because it is only right to do so. I never saw the gentleman in my life; but he has written to me a most violent letter of remonstrance upon something that my learned friend is reported to have said in the newspaper.

Dr. Deane.—You are not singular in that ; we have all had letters of remonstrance from him.

Dr. Phillimore.—I dare say you have ; but Dr. Tregelles writes indignantly to say that he does not hold those opinions ; but whoever he is, he begins his letter by saying, “ I am not a member of the Church of England.” My learned friend says, I quote him as opposed to Dr. Williams. That is what I say : authorities are put up to be knocked down.

Now, my lord, the next observation that applies generally to all these authorities is, that if you look at the particular crotchet, if I may use the expression, which they are supposed to maintain, which is adduced to justify all the heretical opinions of Dr. Williams, you will find that the particular crotchet is always qualified afterwards, and modified by subsequent limitations.

My lord, these are some general remarks upon the authorities that are cited on the other side ; and now I must make another general remark upon the Articles as they stand ; and, in order to do that, I must invite the Court’s attention to the sixth Article of the Indictment, and to the one which has incurred so much censure, “the scope and tendency” Article —the seventeenth.

The sixth Article, it is said, is utterly irrelevant. It is this :—“ We article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that the said articulate Essay or Review, entitled *Bunsen’s Biblical Researches*, has not, during the nine editions aforesaid, undergone any, or at least any material or substantial alteration, but is, in all of them, exactly, or almost exactly, in the very same words as it was when first published by you.” And they say, “ What is the meaning ” of that Article ? It cannot be denied that the statements in these Essays have alarmed and offended the public mind of this country ; that they have called forth the unanimous censure of the Episcopate, and even, my lord, I heard yesterday an explanation offered in this Court of the plain language of Dr. Williams, which appeared to me a denial of the most sacred mysteries of our religion.

I heard this explained away by suggestions of my learned friend, that the words meant something quite different, that they meant Roman superstition, that they meant no Popery, that they were capable of this, that, and the other explanation, speaking with all respect of the argument ; but, be that explanation what it may, how many editions has this volume gone through without any attempt on the part of a beneficed

clergyman with a cure of souls to suggest what he really did mean? Is that defensible conduct on the part of a clergyman to know (and it is not denied at the first blush that his words justify this charge), it, to know that a construction, *prima facie* justifiable, has been put upon his language, that it is at variance with the cardinal verities of the Christian religion, and to allow nine, ten, and eleven editions of the work to go on without a note, without a suggestion, without a hint to any creature who may have lost, who may have been robbed, though I do not believe, God forbid I should say so with Dr. Williams' own goodwill, but who may have been robbed of all that sustains life, and takes the sting from death, by reading this work? But he has not even had the courage or the sincerity to explain a single objectionable passage. I put in this article as to the edition, for this reason, because I think it ought to weigh greatly in the sentence which this Court may come to, whatever that sentence may be, upon Dr. Williams for having published this work. If it had not been done advisedly, if all this pernicious trash had been written hastily and imprudently, and had been repented of, as Dr. Clarke repented of his Arianism, and as men of greater minds than Dr. Williams, before now, have written and sorrowed for it afterwards, why that would have given the prosecution a totally different aspect, and would also have affected the amount of the punishment also, whatever that may be. But there is no suggestion of the kind, and I deny that it is competent to Dr. Williams to suggest by his advocate a totally different meaning to the plain words which he has used, when he might at any time have amended them if that really was his meaning—when he might and ought to have so stated that amendment in one of the numerous editions of the work which he has published.

My lord, I say this in connection with an observation which, perhaps, I ought to have made at the outset, but which I did not. Your lordship will remember, that there is a great peculiarity in the way in which the law is laid down in this case in the first article. We have not pleaded the statute of Elizabeth. I have designedly, with the sanction of the Bishop of Salisbury, abstained from doing so, and why? Because I do think that the statute of Elizabeth is a harsh statute; because it was made in a very different state of circumstances long ago; because I have always doubted myself whether it was intended to be applied to heresy generally; and lastly, because if we had succeeded in our prosecution under the statute of

Elizabeth, it would have left the Court no option whatever, but deprivation ; it would have tied the hands of the Court ; it would have given no *locus penitentiae* whatever to the person proceeded against, and it was not my desire to place the Court in that predicament, I was acting for the Bishop of Salisbury, it was not his desire to cut off all hope of repentance from Dr. Williams. That observation connects itself with the fact, as to the number of editions which have been published without any attempt to alter any of the offensive passages.

Now, my lord, I come to the seventeenth article, which may be said to be the first of our articles, and the seventeenth article may be coupled with the general argument perhaps as to the distinction between a review and a sermon, which the Court may have to deal with.

Now, the seventeenth article pleads “ that the manifest tendency, scope, object, and design of the whole essay, is to inculcate a disbelief in the Divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, contained in the Old and New Testament ; to reduce the said Holy Scriptures to the level of a mere human composition, such as the writings of Luther and of Milton ; to deny that the Old Testament contains prophecies or predictions of our Saviour, and other persons and events ; to deny that the prophets speaking under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit foretold human events ; to deny altogether, or greatly discredit the truth and genuineness of the historical portions of the Old Testament, and the truth and genuineness of certain parts of the New Testament, and the truth and reality of the miracles recorded as facts in the Old and New Testament ; to deny, or interpret by a meaning at variance with that of the Church, the doctrines of original sin, of infant baptism, of justification by faith, atonement, and propitiation by the death of our Saviour, and of the incarnation of our Saviour.” Now, it is objected, my lord, that we have no right to have an article of this kind which is to be a sort of dragnet Article to the whole prosecution, and that we have no right to set out what the tendency, and scope, and object, and design of the work are, and it is said that this is a distinctly criminal prosecution, and the common places—I make use of this expression with all deference to those who have used them—but what I must be allowed to call all the common places upon that subject, are now produced, no doubt it is a criminal prosecution, but it is the criminal prosecution of a clergyman for an heretical work. And is it in reality meant to be intended, that the scope, and tendency, and object, and design

of an heretical work, are not matters which one Ecclesiastical Court must take into its consideration? Is it meant to be said, that if on reading a particular work, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than this, that the author intended to subvert Christianity, the Court is not to take cognizance of that scope, object, end, and design? My lord, it is not like a criminal indictment at common law in that respect with regard to its subject matter. It would perhaps be utterly impossible to frame it in all respects according to that analogy. This is a question of the correction of a clerk, and if a clerk is really guilty of publishing a work, the scope and design of which is manifestly to destroy Christianity, I hear for the first time that upon that being proved to the satisfaction of the Court, he is not liable to ecclesiastical punishment.

Now, it is quite true that the publication takes the form of a review, and it is quite true that this form gives the defenders of the publication a great advantage. You may always say you are quite in a mistake. I do not say this. The author says, I do not say these horrible words which I really hardly now like to repeat, but which are in this essay. "How long shall we bear this fiction of an external revelation?" It is quite true that it is only Baron Bunsen says that, and a clergyman cites him. And how does he cite him? With approbation or with reprobation? Does he say this horrible language is such as a clergyman of the Church of England? I repudiate, and I have only reviewed the work in order to show my horror, that there should be found any man pretending to be a Christian, who could use such language? That is what one might have expected him to have said, if he had had any regard to his position, if he had thought for a moment of the terrible consequences to others, if not to himself, from reading such a work as this. But what does he say, and this is an illustration, and I use it as an illustration of the sort of difficulty into which the argument that it is the author's language, and not the reviewer, may place the prosecutor. So, when he asks, at page 92, "How long shall we bear this fiction of an external revelation?" that is, putting it in his own language, of "one violating the heart and conscience, instead of expressing itself through them?" or when he says, "All this is delusion for those who believe it. But what is it in the mouths of those who teach it?" or when he exclaims, "Oh, the fools! who if they do see the ignorant perils of this age, think to ward them off by narrow-minded persecution!" and when he repeats, "Is it

not time, in truth, to withdraw the veil from our misery ? to tear off the mask from hypocrisy, and destroy that shame which is undermining all real ground under our feet ? to point out the dangers which surround, nay, threaten already to engulf us ?" Does the clergyman go on to say, " This is language so abominable, that I can only mention it to reprobate it ?" No. He says, " There will be some who think his language too vehement for good taste. Others will think burning words needed by the disease of our time. These will not quarrel on points of taste with a man"—(now mark, " with a man " who has declared that the fiction of an external revelation is not intolerable), " with a man," says Dr. Williams, " who in our darkest perplexity has reared again the banner of truth, and uttered thoughts which give courage to the weak, and sight to the blind." There is the teaching of an English clergyman in a review upon a man who has said, " How long shall we bear this fiction of an external revelation." He goes on to say, " If Protestant Europe is to escape those shadows of the twelfth century, which with ominous recurrence are closing around us, to Baron Bunsen will belong a foremost place among the champions of light and right ; any points disputable, or partially erroneous, which may be discovered in his many works, are dust in the balance, compared with the mass of solid learning, and the elevating influence of a noble and Christian spirit. Those who have assailed his doubtful points, are equally opposed to his strong ones. Our own testimony is where we have been best able to follow him, we have generally found most reason to agree with him. But our little survey has not traversed his vast field, nor our plummet sounded his depth." And then there follow, my lord, certain doggrel verses, and you are gravely asked, " To what article of the Church are these doggrel verses opposed ?" Why the question is unworthy of my learned friend's ability. The question is, whether in poetry or prose, however bad both may be, and in my opinion both are equally execrable, the question is, whether he has expressed his agreement with the author. That is the pinching question, not how miserable the vehicle may be in which he has conveyed the sentiment. Why, what has he said ? After eulogizing Baron Bunsen as having discovered this new version of Christianity, he says—

" And when those fables strange our hirelings teach
I saw by genuine learning cast aside,
Even like Linnæus kneeling on the sod,
For faith from falsehood severed thank I God."

Well, now is anybody so blind as not to see, I would almost say, is anybody foolish enough to urge that by “our hirelings teach,” he does not mean the clergy of the Church of England, and by “those fables strange,” he does not mean the usual authorised versions of the Holy Scriptures. Can any body doubt that for a moment? What is the “genuine learning,” which has cast them aside; try the question as a poet, or try it as a person of common sense, what is it that “genuine learning” has “cast aside.” “The fiction of an external revelation.” And am I to be told that a clergyman of the Church of England may do these things with impunity; and that, because he has not expressed in a distinct proposition, “I deny entirely the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the miracles of the New,” he is not amenable to an Ecclesiastical Court for the general scope, tendency, and design of that article? No, my lord, and I wait with deference, but with confidence for your decision upon that point.

My lord, that article, as I said, raises a general question as to this *Essay* or *Review*, which I wish to put in this way—I deny at once that it is competent to a clergyman of the Church of England to review every book he pleases, in every manner he pleases. There is an expression in these very essays about Baron Bunsen “sitting loose to the articles”—but Baron Bunsen never subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles—and if Baron Bunsen choose to build a fabrie, as the people in Laputa did, by beginning at the top instead of at the bottom, and thought he had done a very wise thing, when, poor man, he had merely repeated all the exploded heresies of the last century, he was perfectly at liberty to do it. It is most gratifying to me to learn (though I learned it subsequently to Dr. Williams’ censure), that Baron Bunsen in his private devotions belied his public works, and I hope and believe died a good Christian—but that is by the way—Baron Bunsen might review or write what he liked, but I deny that a clergyman of the Church of England might write or review what he liked. Supposing there was a grossly obscene and indecent book in a foreign language, and a clergyman reviewed it, and extracted all the most offensive passages, and then said, “There are some who think these are too vehement for good taste,” and there left it, he would be liable to be punished. I maintain that it would be conduct unbecoming a clergyman, and bringing great scandal upon the Church, and I have the highest authority for saying, that a scandal upon the Church may ensue even to deprivation of preferment.

Then, my lord, take the next case, may a man review an avowedly infidel work, bearing upon its title page that it is an infidel work, and written avowedly for the purpose of subverting Christianity, may he review it and escape from all condemnation, because he had only translated it so as to make legible throughout England, and in his own parish all the horrible doctrines that are therein, but has not gone on to say *totidem verbis* “I approve?” I say he may do no such thing. I say again he would have brought scandal upon the Church, and would have been punishable, and therefore it comes to a question of degree, and the question is, whether a man may review a work not exactly of that character which I have described, neither professing indecency, nor professing absolute infidelity, but substantially and really teaching it. May he abstract those passages which are most objectionable, and speak of them either with no disapprobation, or with words which are practically and fairly considered as amounting to approbation? I say again that I take issue upon that; I say that he may not.

Now, my lord, the Review in question extends from the 49th to the 93rd page, and it is said to us (and this is the proper time to deal with that objection), you have not made fair extracts, you have taken a passage out here, and you have added it to a passage there, and so on. Now what have we done? In the first place, which is at once an answer to the whole charge, we have appended the whole book to the articles, it is part of the articles, it is incorporated in them; by the eighteenth article it is appended in *toto*. “In part supply of proof of the premises in this and the preceding articles pleaded, and to all other intents and purposes in the law, whatsoever we exhibit hereto annex and will that the same be taken and read as if herein inserted, a printed copy of the said book entitled, *Essays and Reviews*. In the next place, we have invariably given the pages from which we have extracted the articles. It is very true that as the writer is a singularly bad writer, and as he is in the habit of writing in a manner which it is very difficult every now and then to understand, and as he has scattered his mischief over a great many pages, it is very true that in order to satisfy the legal requirements of a Court we have been obliged here and there to take a passage from this page and a passage from that page, but we have invariably given the pages at the same time, and we have shown from whence they come, and it was competent for my learned friend at any time he pleased to contend that you

ought to read it with such and such qualifications. We read these qualifications, and we were not able honestly to say, with more than one or two insignificant exceptions, that they in the least affect the truth of the proposition. Well, in other cases I should have thought that we had erred upon the other side, we have copied pages and pages of this trash, and at full length, and I should have thought that if we have erred at all, we really have erred upon the side of making too copious extracts. However, it is almost impossible in these cases to avoid the censure of those who have an author to defend, and who think that by omitting this passage or that passage his explanation might have been afforded. To that I have this answer to make. If the Court is of opinion that we ought to state any more than we have in order to lay our case fairly, we are perfectly willing if that will gratify my learned friends to have any quantity of the Essay reprinted; provided we are allowed to keep the passages we have, and to make our summary of the doctrine. The first extract, according to the seventh article, is taken from the 60th and 61st pages. The Essay begins at page 50, and the 60th and 61st pages have been preceded by what I may call an admonitory statement. We are told by the writer (and this is his own opinion), at the very first page, that, "Questions of miraculous interference do not turn merely upon our conceptions of physical law as unbroken, or of the Divine will, as all pervading; but they include inquiries into evidence, and must abide by verdicts on the age of records. Nor should the distinction between poetry and prose, and the possibility of imaginations allying itself with affection be overlooked." Then there follow these which I call admonitory words, "We cannot encourage a remorseless criticism of Gentile histories and escape its contagion when we approach Hebrew annals; nor acknowledge a Providence in Jewry without owning that it may have comprehended sanctities elsewhere." Afterwards he goes on and says, "Conscience would not lose by exchanging that repressive idea of revelation which is put over against it as an adversary, for one to which the echo of its best instincts should be the witness," and something about a miracle, which I need not trouble you with at present. There is another passage which I would read, and perhaps it would be in support of that passage at the end which I read about "the hirelings." He says at page 52, (and this will do quite as well for my purpose as the passage which was abandoned from the other Essay), "If we are to retain the old Anglican

foundations of research and fair statement, we must revise some of the decisions provisionally given upon imperfect evidence, or if we shrink from doing so, we must abdicate our ancient claim to build upon the truth; and our retreat will be either to Rome, as some of our lost ones have consistently seen, or to some form, equally evil, of darkness voluntary. The attitude of too many English scholars before the last monster out of the deep is that of the degenerate senators before Tiberius. They stand balanceing terror against mutual shame. Even with those in our universities who no longer repeat fully the required shiboleths, the explicitness of truth is rare. He who assents most, committing himself least to baseness, is reckoned wisest." I pass by entirely the good taste of this passage, comparing all the greater part of the educated clergy of England to the corrupt and degenerate senators, whom Juvenal has condemned to everlasting infamy in this passage, that he refers to when the great fish was brought before Tiberius. I pass by the good taste of that criticism, but what is the meaning of this? What are the "required shiboleths?" Who "stand balanceing terror against mutual shame?" And who are those "who no longer repeat fully the required shiboleths?" Who could doubt what this language points at? It points at those who have not been so ingenious at present as to find how they can reconcile the theories of certain German metaphysicians who have discarded all the facts in Revelation, and put their own speculations in their places, how they can reconcile that with the required shiboleths, he means to say, I suppose, with the Creeds, the Articles, the Formularies of the Church. They are the "required shiboleths," and we who still hold to them are those "who stand balanceing terror against mutual shame," and looking at the body of Bunsen who is the "last monster out of the deep." The whole of this Essay points to a determination throughout to escape from the restraint which the law has placed upon the clergy.

Now I come to my passage. I do not know that I need read it all, as it has been read very often; but I will point out the passage which we have afterwards designated as conveying to us an expression inconsistent with that which a clergyman ought to use. He says, "As in his *Egypt*" our author sifts the historical date of the Bible, so in his *Gott in der Geschichte* he expounds its directly religious element." Then he goes on and says, "Unlike the despairing school, who forbid us trust in God or in conscience, unless we kill our

souls with literalism ; he finds salvation for men and states only in becoming acquainted with the Author of our life, by whose reason the world stands fast, whose stamp we bear in our forethought, and whose voice our conscience echoes. In the Bible, as an expression of devout reason, and, therefore, to be read with reason in freedom, he finds record of the Spiritual grants whose experience generated the religious atmosphere we breathe." We say this, that the effect of this passage is to assert that the Bible, or Holy Scripture, is an expression of devout reason ; and then we couple afterwards with the third passage, which contains these words, " If such a spirit did not dwell in the Church, the Bible would not be inspired—for the Bible is, before all things, the written voice of the congregation." And we say that those two, together, amount to a declaration that the Bible is not, as we have been accustomed to think it, " the Word of God, nor containing any special revelation of His truth, or of His dealings with mankind ; nor the rule of our faith, or that you did therein, advisedly, maintain and affirm doctrines, positions, or opinions to that or the like effect." And we say that that is contrary to the 6th, 7th, and 20th Articles of Religion.

Then there is an intermediate passage put in, which charges against Dr. Williams that he has said, " We find the evidences of our canonical books, and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustration in outward act of principles perpetually true, but not adequate to guarantee narratives inherently incredible or precepts evidently wrong. Hence we are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony." We put all this together, and we say that it amounts in substance to denying the Bible to be the Word of God, in the sense in which our Church uses it.

My lord, the defence first of all was, that this is not the reviewer's opinion, but that it is the author's opinion. I am not quite certain whether that defence is to be taken or not now, because my learned friend who spoke first says it is a passage entirely taken from Bunsen, and that Dr. Williams has nothing at all to do with it. My learned friend who spoke second revealed to us that they had thought, under the particular circumstances of the case, that they had better take independent lines ; and as I understood him—I may be doing him an injustice—but as I understood him, he was of

opinion that it would be ignoble in Dr. Williams to take shelter under anything of this kind, and that he would admit that the passage must be taken as an expression of his opinion, as well as of the author's. But Dr. Williams cannot be deprived of the defence which is set up for him ; and if, on a comparison of the whole essay, the Court is of opinion that Dr. Williams is entirely severed from Baron Bunsen in this opinion, it would then remain as an act of very gross indiscretion on the part of Dr. Williams, and perhaps not much beyond that ; but I wish to know whether the first passage, that is taken altogether from the 60th page, and which ends "we breathe," is certainly stated by Baron Bunsen, as it is said to be. I have not got the original here, but it is supposed to be a mere criticism upon what Baron Bunsen has said. But there is no denial whatever of the fact that this theory as to Scripture is laid down. At the bottom of page 61, it is indeed said "It may be thought that Baron Bunsen ignores too peremptorily the sacerdotal element in the Bible, forgetting how it moulded the form of the history." But I find nowhere, myself, anything to qualify this theory of the Baron. I do not think my learned friend who spoke first pointed out anything qualifying it. I think he contented himself with saying the first passage was Baron Bunsen's, and that there was no word of approbation or assent. I must argue it as if the Court would be bound to find that there was sufficient approbation, or a sufficient want of disapprobation, to make Dr. Williams liable ; it being always remembered that Dr. Williams has said himself, in the first page, "that where he has been best able to follow him, he has generally found most reason to agree with him." What is the meaning of saying the Bible is "an expression of devout reason, and, therefore, to be read with reason in freedom ?" What is the meaning of saying "that the Bible is before all things, the written voice of the congregation ?" I do not care which I take of the two. Is either consistent with the Article which has been so often referred to, and must be referred to again ? I come now to the consideration of the meaning of the words in the 6th Article, "In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." And in the 7th Article, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind." The statement that the Bible is an expression of devout reason,

if it stood alone, might simply be rather an unintelligible expression; but when we find also "the Bible is the written voice of the congregation," such a theory of Inspiration appears to me to be utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of any Inspiration at all, in the right sense of the word, in the Old Testament. My learned friend who spoke first dealt with the passage about the voice of the congregation in a very remarkable manner. He said on the day of Pentecost there was a Divine effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles: the Apostles preached the Gospel, and they were some of the congregation, and in that sense the Bible might be the written voice of the congregation. I venture almost to leave that explanation without any comment, because it is so manifestly a distortion of the words of the writer, and so totally unsupported by anything the writer has said that I think it may stand almost by itself. My learned friend who followed, adopted a different theory, but both the theories may be said to raise the question of the meaning of these Articles of Religion; and, perhaps, this will not be an inconvenient time to take the question of what is the meaning of "In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

A great deal of argument has been addressed to the Court upon these two points—upon the meaning of the word "Canonical," and then upon the meaning of the word "Inspired." It is contended, as far as Inspiration is concerned, that it is an entirely open question—that it was the design and wise intention of those who framed our Liturgy and Articles that it should remain a question upon which each person should be at liberty to exercise his own judgment. It is difficult, in discussing the meaning of the two words, to separate the arguments applicable to each. It is rather difficult, I may observe, to touch upon the question of what is canonical without at the same time trenching upon the subsequent argument of what is inspired. The sixth Article establishes the difference to begin with—not looking *dehors* (as we are in the habit of saying legally) the Article, the Article establishes a negative definition of Canonical books, because "Canonical" is applied to those books of the Old Testament which are recited, and to the books of the New Testament which are not recited, but which were afterwards given at length in the authorized version, and therefore they must be considered as if they were inserted here, and the uncanonical

books, or the other books (the word “uncanonical” is not used), are those which are read “for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet the Church doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.” Then we get a definition from the terms of the Article itself that what is *Canonical*, at all events is used for the establishment of doctrine. But it is said, yes, that may be, but nevertheless that does not mean *inspired*. Now we must look a little to the meaning of the word “Canon.” First of all, *Canon*, as we all know in its literal acceptation, is a rule. It has been variously applied, but it is a rule, and I will read Calmet’s definition in his Dictionary of the Bible. I cannot lay my hand upon the book now, but I will give your Lordship the reference presently. I am now going to cite from the authority of Bishop Cosin; he is a great authority upon this point, because he wrote upon the Canon, and here is his work—it is called, *A Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture; or, the Certain and Indubitable Books thereof, as they are received in the Church of England*. I have already stated to the Court the claims of Dr. Cosin to be considered as an authority, he having been one of the compilers of the Prayer Book. He gives a clear account of what he considers to be the meaning of “Canonical” and “Canon;” in the first chapter he sets out the Article as it is here, and then in chapter 1, in the preface, he says, “The Books of Scripture are therefore called Canonical, because as they had their prime and sovereign authority from God himself, by whose Divine Will and inspiration they were first written and by whose blessed providence they have been ever since preserved and delivered over to posterity, so they have been likewise received and in all times acknowledged by his Church to be the infallible rule of our faith, and the perfect square of our actions in all things that are any way needful for our eternal salvation.” He cites as marginal notes the passage from Timothy, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God”—the passage from St. Peter, “Holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”—and the passage from Luke, “As he spake by the mouth of His Holy prophets.” He then says, “other books what honour soever they have heretofore had in the Church, or what is there still continued to them, yet if they cannot show all these marks and characters upon them: 1. That they are of supreme and Divine authority. 2. That they were written by men specially acted and inspired for that purpose by the Spirit of God. 3. That they were by the same men and the

same men and the same authority delivered over for such to all posterity. 4. That they have been received for such by the Church of God in all ages; and, 5. That all men are both to regulate their faith and to measure their actions by them as the undoubted witness of God's infallible truth, and ordinances declared in them. "If," says this learned writer, "they want any of those peculiar and proper notes of difference whereby the books of God are distinguished from the writings of men, pious and useful books they may be in their kind, but they shall want that honour which is specially reserved to the dignity of Sovereign and Divine Scripture whereunto this honour is due (saith St. Augustine), and to no other writing besides. That whatsoever is there said is undoubtedly true and ought most firmly to be believed without any further question or disceptation about it, which cannot be said of any other writing that was ever yet composed and sent abroad into the world." He then goes on to give a list of the Canonical Scriptures, and the volume is occupied by a discussion which is terminated page 222, chapter 19, in which he gives the conclusion and summary of all the former chapters. "The conclusion, therefore, of all this discourse will be, That the religion of the Church of England in her Article concerning the Holy Scriptures (whereunto the public confession of the Reformed and Protestant Churches abroad, besides the Christians of the East and South parts of the world, would be agreeable) is truly Catholic; that the ancient Church of the Old Testament acknowledg'd no other books to be Canonical than we do. That our blessed Saviour and his Apostles after him received no other. That the several ages following adhered to the same Canon. That the authors of the books of Tobit and Judith, and the rest of that order, were no prophets inspired of God, to write his authentical Scriptures. That they who first put these Dentero Canonical or Ecclesiastical books into the volume of the Bible, did not thereby intend to make them equal to the books of Moses and the Prophets, but only to recommend them unto the private and public reading of the Church, both for the many excellent precepts and examples of life that be in them, and for the better knowledge of the history and estate of God's people, from the time of the Prophets to the coming of Christ. That it is not in the power of the Roman Church, nor any other, either to make new articles of faith, or to make any books Sacred and Canonical Scriptures (so as to be binding rules of our faith and religion) which were not such in their own nature before,

that is, inspired by God, and by his authority only ordained to be such from the time when they were first written." Therefore as far as this learned writer is concerned, "inspired by God," and "Canonical," are identical in their meaning in the Thirty-nine Articles.

I may, indeed, at once tell the Court that I shall contend in the language of the Article which I have read, the sixth Article, that there is no doubt that "canonical" does mean "inspired," and that the force of the expression would not be in the least increased if the word "inspired" were added to it, and that looking to contemporaneous authorities, there is no question that they used the word "canonical" as they would the word "inspired." The authority I have cited is one instance.

Now let us look at another authority. Barrow, in volume 6, Oxford edition, page 32, sermon 34, which is a sermon on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, says. First, it is His especial work (speaking of the Holy Ghost) "to declare God's mind to us, whence he is styled the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of prophecy, the Spirit of revelation; for that all supernatural light and wisdom have ever proceeded from Him. He instructed all the prophets that have been since the world began, to know. He enabled him to speak the mind of God concerning things present and future. Holy men (that have taught men their duty and led them in the way to bliss) were but His instruments, speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Then follow the words, "By His inspiration the Holy Scriptures (the most full and certain witness of God's mind, the law and testimony by which our life is to be directed and regulated) were conceived. He guides the Apostles into all truth, and by them instructed the world in the knowledge of God's gracious intentions towards mankind, and in all the Holy mysteries of the Gospel." Then he proceeds to make these citations from the New Testament. "That which in these ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit," and so on, and then he says, "All the knowledge we can pretend to in these things doth proceed merely from his revelation, doth wholly rely upon his authority." That is an authority which would rather be for inspiration, but it is difficult, as I have said, to separate the authorities for "canonical," from those for "inspiration."

The next authority is from Archbishop Tillotson's Sermons, it is either volume xii., or volume xix., according to the edition, it is page 100 in the one I have. In the third paragraph of the third sermon on the text, "Without faith it is impos-

sible to please God." The question is, what assurance miracles give, that those persons who are said to be the penmen of the Books of Scripture were divinely inspired? The miracles (under which I comprehend the prediction of future events), which Moses, and the prophets, and the apostles wrought, were testimonies from heaven, that they were Divine persons, and that what they said was to be credited, and consequently, if they gave out themselves for such, that they were such. That the penmen of the New Testament were persons endued with a miraculous power, is plain, because they were most of them apostles; and for the rest, we have no reason to doubt it, those extraordinary gifts being so common in the primitive times. However, so long as there is nothing in the rest, that is dissonant from or contrary to, what those wrote, of whose inspirations we are assured, and these their writings (this is an important passage upon the point), "Having always been received in the Church as of Divine inspiration, which we may well presume was not rashly done, and without grounds we have no reason to doubt, as to them, or if there were, so long as they contain nothing that is contrary to those who were unquestionably inspired, the matter is of no dangerous consequence; and as for the penmen of the Old Testament, we are assured that they were all inspired, by one in the New Testament, that was unquestionably so, viz., St. Paul." The authority upon the point of law is not weak, because it is that of Archbishop Tillotson. He had been very much mixed up with the resettlement of ecclesiastical affairs in the time of William and Mary, and was inclined, as is well known, to the most liberal view that could be taken.

I will next refer to Tomline's *Theology*, volume i., page 19, This authority is taken from a chapter which has this heading, "Chapter the first, of the authenticity and inspiration of the Books of the Old Testament." The whole of the chapter is upon that; and at page 18, he says, "It is great argument for the truth of the Scriptures, that they have stood the test and received the approbation of so many ages, and still retain their authority, though so many ill men in all ages have made it their endeavour to disprove them, but it is a still further evidence in belief of them, that God has been pleased to show so remarkable a providence in their preservation;" and then follow these words, "but the most decisive proof of the authenticity and inspiration of the ancient Scriptures is derived from the New Testament. The Saviour of the world himself, even he who came expressly from the Father of Truth to bear witness to the truth in the last instructions which He gave to

his apostles before his ascension, said, “These are the words I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me. Our Lord, by thus adopting the common division of the law, the prophets and the Psalms which comprehended all the Hebrew Scriptures testified the canon of the Old Testament, as it was received by the Jews, and by declaring that those books contained prophesies which must be fulfilled, he established their Divine inspiration, since God alone can enable man to foretell future events.”

I now go to the second volume of the same work, page 190, where he is giving an exposition of this very article; he says, “The Divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently their truth and obligation, is allowed both by Papists, and by members of our Church, but the Papists assert that the books of the New Testament do not contain the whole rule of a Christian’s faith and practice. They believe that the apostles orally delivered many doctrines and precepts of the highest importance to our external happiness, which are not contained in the New Testament.” And then he goes on: “On the contrary, we of the Church of England affirm, that the Scriptures contain a complete rule of faith and practice, and we reject every doctrine and precept as essential to salvation, or to be obeyed as Divine, which is not supported by their authority.” Now, my lord, I come to an authority which, if it has not the advantage of years, as a contemporary authority has every advantage, if I may take the liberty of saying so, which a book can derive from the learning, and wisdom, and genius of its author. It is called, *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, written by William Lee, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and perhaps it will be found to contain upon this great subject, the most complete exposition that the Church has yet furnished. At all events, it is one by which I am very willing to be bound. He states the question, and I shall be under the necessity of recurring to it by and by, but I wish more especially to confine my attention now to identifying “canon” with “inspiration,” and in his appendix, at page 497, of the second edition, note 7, he says this: “The title canonical requires also to be noticed, and first of all the language of councils demands attention.” And then he cites the Council of Carthage, nomine vi., ordine tempor v. (A.D., 419)—“Et ut praeter Scripturas canonicas nihil in Ecclesiâ legatur sub nomine Divinarum Scripturarum.

Sunt autem et Canoniceæ Scripturæ,” not an unimportant citation—that is at p. 419; and then, at p. 498, in his notes, he goes on to state what they are. Then he quotes what is called the Quinisest Council, and he quotes the Council of Laodicea. “οὗτοι δεῖ δέχεσθαι καὶ ἀναγνώσκειν πάσας τὰς δεδεγμένας θεῖας γραφὰς, τῆς τε παλαιᾶς καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης.” Then he shows the use of the title “ Canonical,” as used by individual Fathers, and he quotes Ignatius and Augustine. Upon Augustine, I may, without an imputation of pedantry, say a word to the Court. It is notorious that our Reformers relied mainly upon Augustine in the composition of our articles, and he is referred to over and over again, in the articles and in the Homilies; and the Court may remember a great discussion upon his authority in the Denison case. It will not, however, be gainsaid by the other side, that of all the Fathers he was the one to whom all the Reformers looked with the greatest affection, and whose footsteps they intended to follow, as appears upon the face of the articles. This learned writer says, “From the numerous passages in which this title is employed by St. Augustine (A.D. 396), I select the following,” and then he quotes from *De Civilitate Dei*, book xviii., chapter 38, title 7, page 521, and I have verified that (I have the book beside me), and I find it to be a perfectly accurate quotation. He says, “Augustin suggests that the books referred to by the sacred writers, and not received into the canon, were excluded, because those persons to whom the Holy Ghost at times revealed what should have authority in religion;” and this is the quotation, “Alia sicut homines historiae diligentia alia sicut Prophetas Inspiratione Divina scribere potuisse; atque haec ita fuisse distineta, ut illa tanquam Deo per ipsos loquenti, judicarentur esse tribuenda; ac sic illa pertinerent ad ubertatem cognitionis, haec ad religionis auctoritatem; *in qua auctoritate custoditur canon*,” in whose authority the canon is kept. The Court will remember the exact expression in our article of the Church of England, the Church which is *the keeper of Holy Writ*. Then there is another quotation which is taken from his sermon, “Contra Cresconium Donatistam,” which I have not verified myself, but I can have it verified if there should be any dispute as to the authenticity of it. He says, “Nos eum nullam Cypriano facimus injuriam eum ejus quaslibet literas a Canoniceâ Divinarum Scripturarum auctoritate distinguimus.” There the words “are put together, the only distinction between that and our article being, that the word “*Divinarum*” is put in. And then at page 499, he gives a gloss which is not necessary to read, and then he gives a pas-

sage from Erasmus, which I may as well cite. Erasmus, in speaking of the Canonical Scriptures, says—“ Nomen Scripturæ Canoniceæ quot volumina complectitur? Istud expedite docuit Cyprianus Hebræi trifariam distinguunt omnem Scripturam, canonicam appellant citra controversiam afflatu Sancti Spiritus proditam.” I will now ask your lordship’s attention to the note which follows, which is note 2. At note 2, are these words: “ I have dwelt on the force of the word ‘ Canonical,’ and its invariable use in the sense of ‘ Scripture given by inspiration of God,’ because this fact affords a complete answer to an assertion sometimes made, that the Church of England leaves the doctrine of inspiration an open question.” The framers of the sixth Article knew but one sense of the word, a sense consecrated by the usage of centuries. When they argued with their opponents on the subject of Scripture, their constant appeal was to the meaning which the Fathers assigned to the word “ Canonical” (see the publications of the Parker Society, *passim*). St. Augustine, of course, being the leading authority with men who held his opinions so strongly, and who have twice quoted his words in the short space of the “ Articles of Religion” (Article 10, and expressly Article 29). I may also refer to the “ Wurtemburg Confession,” a document notoriously made use of by the English Reformers, when the Thirty-nine Articles were finally settled, and the words of which are used in Article six, “ Sacram Scripturam vocamus eos Canonicos Libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti de quorum auctoritate in Ecclesiâ nunquam dubitatum est, hanc Scripturam credimus, et confitemur esse oraculum Spiritus Sancti.”

There is a passage in aid of this, which I cite from *Butler’s Analogy*, vol. i., part 2, cap. 7, sec. 3, p. 254, of the common Oxford edition. “ To say, then, that the Scriptures, and the things contained in them, can have no other or further meaning than those persons thought or had who first recited or wrote them, is evidently saying that those persons were the original, proper, and sole authors of those books, that is, that they are not inspired, which is absurd, whilst the authority of those books is under examination, that is till you have determined they are of no Divine authority at all. Till this be determined, it must in all reason be supposed, not indeed that they have, for that is taking for granted that they are inspired, but that they may have some further meaning than what the compilers saw or understood.” The inference from that is (he is arguing with the Atheist) that the Church of England held them to be inspired.

There is a little book that I think my learned friend intro-

duced me to, by Westcott, published at Cambridge, in 1855, called, “*A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the Four Centuries.*” At page 471, he puts the motto to the chapter from Athanasius, in these words, “ἐπληρώθη τότε πάντες ἡλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἀφανιστικὸν ἀλλὰ καθαρικόν,” and then he says, at page 527, “The testimony of Jerome may be considered as the testimony of the Roman Church, for not only was he educated at Rome, but his labours on the text of Scripture were undertaken at the request of Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and later Popes republished the canon which he recognized. Innocent and Gallaeus both pronounced all the books of the New Testament which we now receive, and these only, to be canonical, and the judgment which was accepted at Rome was current throughout Italy.” And then, he says, “Augustine has given a list of the books of the New Testament exactly agreeing with our present canon.” At page 536, he refers to an authority that I think my learned friend, Mr. Fitzjames Steven, referred to—Fulke. “Fulke, again, in his answer to Martin, states, that the Holy Scriptures, according to the acknowledgement of the English Church, are all and every one of equal credit and authority, as being all inspired of God.” But it is useless to multiply quotations, for I am not aware that the judgement of the English Church, as expressed by her theologians, has ever varied as to the canonical authority of any of the books of the New Testament, and he refers to Fulke’s defence of the translation of the Bible, page 8, edition of the Parker Society. There is one observation which occurs upon the very reading of the Articles themselves, and one which appears too difficult to answer. The Old and the New Testament are both put under the same category of canonical. Now those who contend that “canonical” is not equivalent in its use in this particular Article to inspired, must contend that the New, as well as the Old, Testament is not described by the Article as inspired.

Now, my lord, I am brought to an argument upon the general question of Inspiration, which I can most unfeignedly say I approach with nothing but awe, but which it would be a mere shrinking from my duty not to deal with, and though these sacred matters are discussed in a court of justice, yet I hope, from the manner in which this cause has been conducted, no irreverence will ensue therefrom, but that we may continue, as we have begun, so to make those necessary citations so as not in any way to shock those who regard with the greatest reverence everything relating to Holy Writ. I make this preface because I am about to put a dilemma which I

confess appears to me to be perfectly unavoidable, with regard to a matter, which has not yet been attempted to be met by the argument on the other side, and concerning which there is the most remarkable silence in the whole of Dr. Williams's *Essay*. You who contend, as my learned friend behind me does, boldly, that the inspiration of the Old Testament, and the prophecies, is an open question ; you who contend that it is perfectly within the competence of every clergyman of the Church of England to say that the Prophets were holy and moral men, inspired in the same sense as all other holy and moral men are, but who did not in their prophecies give any specific prediction of future events, and, above all, of those events of the New Testament with which all our hopes as Christians are bound up ; you, who hold that opinion, how do you extricate yourselves from this dilemma ? If I show you that, I will not say innumerable passages, because they are numerable, but in about an hundred passages, our Blessed Lord himself and the Holy Apostles have distinctly stated that the prophet was inspired who foretold certain events, how do you escape from this dilemma—that the person so speaking was either himself ignorant, or deceived, or a deceiver ? My lord, it is a dilemma which I can claim no merit for putting—it is a dilemma which was admirably put in a work which is referred to, as it appears to me, in the most ignorant and superficial manner in this *Essay*, in the great work of Bishop Chandler, in answer to the Deists of his time—either, he said, you deny the authority of those who applied those Scriptures to themselves on the ground that they were predicted of them, or you must admit the theory of inspiration.

Bishop Chandler wrote a book, called “ *A Defence of Christianity, from the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, wherein are considered all the Objections against this kind of proof advanced in a late discourse of the *Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*. ” *Grounds and Reasons* was an Infidel publication, I think by Chubb, I am not quite sure whether it was by Chubb or Collins, but it was an Infidel publication under that name. It would be really most amusing (if such an epithet could be applied) to see the way in which this very learned person, Dr. Williams, whose censure by the Ecclesiastical Court is to operate, according to my learned friend, as the destruction of all the learning of the Church, has dealt with this particular question about Bishop Chandler. He says, at page 65 of *Essays and Reviews*—“ In our country each successive defencē of the prophecies in proportion as its author was able, detracted something from the extent of literal

prognostication, and either laid stress on the moral element, or urged a second as the spiritual sense. Even Butler foresaw the possibility that every prophecy in the Old Testament might have its elucidation in contemporaneous history; but literature was not his strong point, and he turned aside, endeavouring to limit it, from an unwelcome idea. Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic; others restricted this character to five. Paley ventures to quote only one." (Now, I say, apart from the censure which this book justly deserves on other grounds, a more disingenuous statement I never met with.) "Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic; others restricted this character to five." What is the inference from that? Why, that Bishop Chandler thought that there were only twelve passages in the Old Testament which were prophetic of Our Saviour, and that Bishop Chandler said so. Chandler is not a very easy book to get, and it is clear that Dr. Williams had never looked at it when he published this statement. Bishop Chandler says no such thing. What Bishop Chandler does say is, that out of a great number of prophecies he has selected twelve, which is a very different story. At page 62 of his *Defence of Christianity*, he says, "But not to rest in generals, let the disquisition of particular texts determine the truth of this author's assertion. To name them all would carry me into too great a length. I shall therefore select some of the principal prophecies which, being proved to regard the Messias immediately and solely in the obvious and literal sense according to scholastic rules, may serve as a specimen of what the Scriptures have predicted" of a Messias that was to come; so that instead of his being said to have found only twelve, he selected twelve of the principal out of others which would carry him to too great a length. Now, he deals with this question throughout the whole of his book. I cannot read the whole work—the whole work is upon the subject—but, at page 413, chapter vi., section 3, he says, "The second proposition, which I here advance, is this, that the miracles of Christ were such as demanded credit, of his interpretations, for His works' sake. If it were questioned whether a prophecy belongs to the Messias by reason of the general terms it is delivered in, or of some expressions in the context that seem to restrain the event of persons or facts nearer to the prophet's days, the ambiguity ought to cease after it hath been determined, to one sense, by the authority of a person that maketh miracles. Thus Christ's disciples, who at first believed

the Messias should be a temporal deliverer, and consequently should understand the prophecies which spoke of his sufferings and death, were at last convinced of the truth of Christ's sense of those prophecies from His resurrection." And then he says, at page 416, in the same chapter, after dwelling upon that subject—"What should well-meaning impartial people say to these things? If they were deceived, God did (pardon that expression) deceive them. Either he that spoke in his name, and acted by his power, did truly explain the prophecies to them, or the gracious God equally a lover of truth, and of his creatures, lent his power to an impostor, to lay honest people under an invincible necessity to believe his imposture. They had a good evidence of the hand of God in those works of wonder that he had wrought, as they had for his eternal power and Godhead in the visible works of the creation." That is the way in which Bishop Chandler puts the dilemma. He then refers to the different prophecies of our Saviour, which our Saviour himself recognised as such. Now, of course, to go through the whole of these prophecies would be a task which I am not called upon to perform. This argument is sufficient for me, but I will refer the Court to a summary which is given in many books, and admirably by Barrow in his famous 76th Sermon upon the sufferings of Christ, foretold in the Old Testament. He begins his sermon in this way: "Many good arguments there are, different in kind, which conspire to persuade the truth of our religion; such as are the intrinsic reasonableness, excellency, and perfection of its doctrine; the miraculous works performed in attestation thereto; the special favour of Providence declared in the support and propagation thereof; but upon no other ground do the Scriptures so much build its truth, and our obligation to embrace it, as upon the exact correspondence and conformity thereof to all the ancient Scriptures, which did foreshow or foretell its revelation and introduction into the world—to those especially which described the personal characters, circumstances, and performances of our Lord. To this our Lord, in his discourses and disputes with incredulous people, referred them—'Search the Scriptures,' said he, 'because in them ye expect to have eternal life'—that is, to find the true way of saving truth leading thereto—'and those are they which testify of me.' By this he instructed and convinced his disciples; beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself; and these (said he to them presently before his departure) are the words which I spake

“unto you while I was with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. This the Apostles, in all their preaching (whereby they taught, proved, and persuaded the Christian doctrine) did chiefly insist upon. ‘Moses,’ saith St. Peter, ‘truly said unto the fathers, yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken have likewise foretold of these days.’ ‘And to him,’ saith he again, ‘give all the prophets witness that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins.’ And of St. Paul, it is said, that he mightily convineed the Jews—showing, by the Scriptures, that Jesus was the Christ; and he expounded and testified the Kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the Prophets. Thus the chief Apostles and founders of our religion; in their public discourses and in their Epistles, they observed the same method, as particularly asserting Christian doctrines and duties by the testimonies of prophetical Scriptures; so generally affirming our religion to be chiefly grounded on them, of which salvation (saith St. Peter, concerning the salvation exhibited by the Gospel) the Prophets did inquire and search diligently, who prophesied of the grace to come unto you. And, in regard to the conviction of others, he seems to prefer the attestation of this kind before the special revelation immediately made to the Apostles: for, having spoken of it, he subjoins *καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον.* We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye do take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. And St. Paul saith that the mystery which was kept secret, since the world began, was then made manifest; and by the prophetical Scriptures, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations to the obedience of faith. And the Holy writings, he telleth Timothy, were able to make him wise to the salvation which is by the faith of Jesus Christ. That is, they were able to show and persuade to him the truth of Christianity, which promiseth salvation to all that heartily embrace it and observe its laws. Such a stress was laid upon this probation by the founders of our religion; and no wonder, for that is not extremely forcible in itself, but hath some particular uses and some peculiar advantages beyond others—the foreknowledge of future contingent events, such as were many of those concerning our Saviour, depending upon the freest acts of human will. As it is for the manner of attaining

“it most incomprehensible to us, so it is most proper to God, and by all men so acknowledged—future contingencies being secrets with no man; no angel, no creature, can dive into, they being not discernible in their causes, which are indeterminate; nor in themselves, who are finite. The prediction, therefore, of such events, could not otherwise than proceed from his pleasure; neither could he yield it in way of favour and approbation to that which was not perfectly true and good: this way, therefore, doth absolutely confirm the truth and goodness of Christian doctrine. It, withal, manifests the great worth and weight thereof, as implying the particular regard and care God had of it, designing it so anciently, laying trains of Providence toward it, and preparing such evidences for the confirmation thereof. It, together, into the bargain, maintaineth the truth of the Jewish dispensation, the sincerity of the ancient patriarchs and prophets, and the vigilant care the Divine goodness hath always had over the state of religion, and toward the welfare of mankind, never leaving it destitute of some immediate revelations from himself. It had a peculiar aptitude to convert the Jews, who were possessed with a full persuasion concerning the veracity and sanctity of their ancient prophets; and could not, therefore, doubt concerning the truth of that which appeared conformable to that which they had foretold should be declared and dispensed for their benefit. This probation also hath this advantage that it, singly taken, doth convince; whereas, others can hardly do it otherwise than in conjunction with one another, and especially with its aid, for the goodness of the doctrine may be contested in some points; and, however good it seem, it may be imputed to human invention. Strange effects may be deemed deducible by other causes besides Divine power, and they may be suffered to be done for other ends than for confirmation of truth: they are also commonly transient, and thence most liable to doubt. Providence also is, in many cases, so mysterious and unsearchable, that the incredulous will never allow any inferences to be drawn from it; but the plain correspondence of events to the standing records of ancient prophecies—obvious and conspicuous to every one that will consult and compare them—concerning a person to be sent by God, who should have such circumstances and be so qualified, who should, in God’s name, preach such doctrines and perform such works, is a proof which alone may assure any man that such a person doth come from God, and in what he declarereth or doeth approved by him; no counterfeiting can here take place, no evasion can be devised from the force of this proof.

“This way, therefore, of discourse our Lord and his Apostles—whose business it was, by the most proper and effectual methods, to subdue the reasons of men to the obedience of faith and entertainment of Christian truth—did especially use as generally in respect to all things concerning our Lord, so particularly in regard to his Passion, declaring it to happen punctually according to what had been foreseen by God, and thence foreshowed by his Prophets rightly understood.” He then goes on to dwell at great length upon all the texts in the prophecies and the Psalms, which our Lord himself and his Apostles applied to themselves. The whole sermon is full of them; it is a collection of all the passages, in the Prophets and the Psalms, which our Lord and his Apostles applied to themselves as Divine predictions. It is not necessary, I think, to read any more; yet there is one passage which, perhaps, I might read from his thirtieth sermon, on the text, “On the third day He rose again.” And he says, at page 463, “It was needful to illustrate the veracity, wisdom, and providence of God, by making good what he had signified in the ancient Scriptures concerning it—either in mystical adumbrations or by express predictions—understood according to those infallible expositions which the Apostles did receive from the instruction of our Lord or from illumination of that Spirit which dictated the Scriptures; the particular instances, as being obvious and requiring large discourse, I forbear to mention.”

The position therefore is of the greatest importance, because if you deny (as it is claimed by my learned friend on behalf of his client) that the prophecies contain predictions of our Lord, you place yourself in opposition to all that He has said upon the subject, and all that His apostles have said. Now, is not it a remarkable thing that there is no reference to that difficulty in the whole of this Essay? I have no doubt, I will not say how Baron Bunsen particularly, but how the school which Dr. Williams followed, and which has been exploded, though he does not seem to be aware of it, would have answered the difficulty. They would have said, All these texts may or may not be corrupt, we have not seen the original, we do not know where it is, and as we build from top to bottom, instead of from bottom to top, as we have got a speculation of what religion ought to be, if it is not as we say, as the Frenchman said, *tant pis pour les faits*, we cannot help ourselves, we are quite certain of our theory, and if you produce those texts there are some means of getting rid of them (we cannot exactly say what they are), either by a “verifying faculty,” or by a “remorseless criticism;” by the

“verifying faculty,” we say they could not have said anything of the kind, and “a remorseless criticism” has got rid of the texts in which they did say so. That is not a comfortable doctrine for the parishioners of Broad Chalk. The bare statement goes a very long way to dispose altogether of the possibility of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures having ever been left an open question in the Church of England. “Inspiration” no doubt has various meanings, but it is a mere logomachy, it is a mere fighting with words. You might as well say that the word “Scriptures,” has various meanings, and that because Imogen says, “the scriptures of the loyal Leonatus all turned to heresy,” meaning private letters, Shakespeare was alluding to the Holy Scriptures. Who doubts that the “inspiration,” in a particular passage in the Prayer Book applies to that inspiration which the Holy Ghost gives to those who duly ask for it; but it surely is the idlest of all arguments to cite the use of “inspiration” in the Prayer Book, used in the common sense of the word “inspiration,” namely, “breathing in,” for that sense of inspiration which is canonical, and by common consent applied only to one subject. When you speak of Scripture, what do you mean? You mean the Holy Scriptures. When you speak of inspiration what do you mean! You do not mean God’s ordinary agency on the mind of a good man. When you say a prophet was inspired, you mean of course that he had the power of foretelling future events.

A good deal has been said upon a subject which must be dealt with. A good deal has been said about literal inspiration, and it is said, that you are driven to this absurdity. You must say that every punctuation, and every letter, and every expression is inspired by the Holy Ghost. Why, my lord, that is to assume an amount of ignorance of all the great writers of the English Church, which nothing but the necessity could have driven my learned friend to. There is the famous sermon of Bishop Bull on the very question on the text, “The cloak and parchments which I left at Troas,” and so forth. But the question has been discussed over and over again, and the Church of England has never holden that doctrine of literal inspiration, which is a pious opinion, to be binding upon the Church. I have nothing to do with that excellent man, Dr. Chalmers’ opinion about inspiration, nor with what the *Westminster Catechism* may have said, nor with any other document which is not the foundation of the doctrines of the Church of England. I have to do with the explanation given

by the Church of England herself, and I defy my learned friends to find any such statement.

I will come presently to the proof, not in my own language, but in the language of great divines, that the Church of England has held the doctrine of *plenary inspiration* always, and that the distinction which he has drawn between *plenary inspiration* and *literal inspiration* is perfectly intelligible. It would be no argument if the Church of England had held that pious opinion of literal inspiration (for it is a pious opinion, though in my opinion a mistaken one), that because certain absurd consequences would follow from it, therefore you could set aside the plain meaning of the articles and the canons.

Now there is a point which I must not pass by. In these articles, the “Word of God” is used in the 17th, in the 21st, in the 22nd, and, I think, in the 24th. The last words of the 17th are, “In our doings that the Will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.” The 21st says “General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the “Spirit and Word of God.”) In the 22nd we find, “The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images, as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrantry of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” And in the 24th, we find, “It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publice prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.” Now in the twentieth Article there is this remarkable addition, “The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. And yet it is not lawful in the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.” Now, my lord, can it be conceived for a moment that the addition of that word, “written,” adds the slightest force to “God’s Word.” “God’s Word written,” it happens to say in that article; in the other articles, the expression that

is used is “God’s Word.” Now, in the name of common sense, what is God’s Word in the Bible, if that be not inspired? What is God’s Word as distinguished from the word of Shakespeare, and Luther, and Milton, in their works? The more it is examined, the more it will be seen, that a more baseless delusion, if these persons have been building upon it, that they could deny the inspiration of the Bible, because the word, “inspiration” in so many letters did not occur in the articles, was never built upon. If the word “inspiration” had been added to “God’s Word written,” would it have added a single tittle of force or strength to “God’s Word”?

My lord, in resuming my argument to-day, I wish to state that yesterday I left off with the subject of the Homilies, and I was about to cite some passages from those works upon the doctrine of inspiration. Before I do so, I desire to add one or two to the catalogue of authorities referred to in my argument of yesterday, as to what is a faithful subscription to the Articles. I wish to add the authority of Burnet on the thirty-nine Articles, pp. 9 and 10. “But I come,” this author says, “in the next place to consider what the clergy is bound to by their subscriptions. The meaning of every subscription is to be taken from the design of the imposer, and from the words of the subscription itself. The title of the Articles bears, that they were agreed upon in Convocation for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true religion where it is evident that a consent in opinion is designed. If we, in the next place, consider the declaration that the Church has made in the canons, we shall find, that though by the fifth canon, which relates to the whole body of the people, such are only declared to be excommunicated *ipso facto* who shall affirm any of the Articles to be erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to; yet the thirty-sixth canon is express for the Clergy, requiring them to subscribe willingly, and *ex animo*, and acknowledge all and every article to be agreeable to the word of God, upon which canon it is that the form of the subscription runs in these words, which seem expressly to declare a man’s own opinion, and not a bare consent to an article of peace, or an engagement to silence and submission.”

On the point of Dr. Clarke’s suspension, I mentioned yesterday the authority without giving the volume or the page. I wish to supply that omission. The history of Dr. Clarke’s recantation of his Arianism is to be found in Cardwell’s *Synodalia*, page 785.

There were also some passages in Calmet on the question of the Canon, which I could not lay my hand upon yesterday. I have them now. Calmet, as your lordship recollects, was born in 1692, and died in 1757—I quote from Taylor's edition of him in 1829. He is an authority very much relied upon by English commentators on the Bible, especially by Dr. Mant. He says upon the word canon, “it is a rule—also to distinguish those books of Scripture which are received as inspired, and indisputable from profane, apochryphal, or disputed books.” And on the word “prophet,” in the fourth paragraph, he says “the usual way by which God communicated his will to the prophets was by inspiration, which consisted in illuminating the mind of the prophet, and inciting him to proclaim what the Lord had dictated. In this sense we acknowledge as prophets all the authors of all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.” Bingham, in his *Christian Antiquities* (Book x., ch. 3, sect. 2), on the question “why a creed is called a canon and *regula fidei*,” says, “Κανών the rule so called because it was the known standard or rule of faith by which orthodoxy and heresy were examined and judged.....answers to the Latin term *regula fidei*, &c.”

Waterland has a passage on the same subject (vol. iv., page 449, edition 1843, Oxford), *Regeneration Stated and Explained*. “From Regeneration by the Spirit it appears but a small and slight transition to go on to inspiration, for that is a good word when used in a just and sober sense, and it is frequently so used in our Church Liturgy. But the word will also bear a much higher sense as when ascribed to the Apostles or sacred penmen.”

Then, my lord, upon the term *Canon*, I wish also to cite from a very famous work, *Jones's Canon of the New Testament*. I believe it is *the* work on the subject. I had the good fortune to buy this copy at the sale of Bishop Coplestone's library, and I see by his marks in the margin that he had studied it. In p. 19 he says, “The infinitely good God having favoured mankind with a revelation of his will, has thereby obliged all those, who are blessed with the knowledge thereof, to regard it as the unerring rule of their faith and practice. Under this character, the Prophets, Apostles and other writers of the sacred books, published and delivered them to the world, and on this account they were dignified above all others with the titles of the canon and canonical. The word canon is originally Greek, and did in that language (as well as in the Latin afterwards) commonly denote that which was a rule or standard by which other things were to

be examined and judged. And inasmuch as the books of divine inspiration contained the most remarkable rules and the most important directions of all others, the collection of them, in time, obtained the name of the Canon, and each book was called “ Canonical.”

So that at all events I have the authority of this distinguished author for saying that in his opinion the word “ canonical ” in the Articles, and the word “ inspired ” are identical.

Dean of the Arches.—What is the title of the book?

Dr. Phillimore.—“ A new and full method of settling the Canonical authority of the New Testament, to which is subjoined a vindication of the former part of St. Matthew’s Gospel, from Mr. Whiston’s Charge of Dislocations ; in three volumes ; by the Reverend Jeremiah Jones.” This edition was published at the Oxford Clarendon Press, in 1798. No one will dispute that it is the book on the canon which is always referred to. It is distinct altogether from Jones of Nayland’s book. To continue my citation from this author. “ At what time they were first thus called is not very easy to determine. Some imagine St. Paul himself to have given this title to the sacred books extant in his time, (Gal., vi., 16, and Phil., iii., 16). But the Apostle seems in those places rather to speak of the doctrine of the Gospel, than any books which contained it, although it is very probable that St. Paul’s using the word canon in these places, was the occasion of its afterwards being affixed to the books themselves. This seems the most genuine account of the original of this appellation ; nor do I know of any other that has been, or can be assigned, besides that of Mr. Du Pin and Mr. Whiston.”

I wish also to add an authority upon another point which I dealt with yesterday. Upon that very important question, whether the selections of Scripture in the Liturgy ought to be taken literally, as containing the doctrine of the Church, I wish to refer to two passages in *Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity* ; one in book v., paragraph 19, just towards the end ; it is in these words (he was answering the objection that too much Scripture is read in our churches mixed up with the prayers) : “ For with us the reading of Scripture in the church is a part of our Church Liturgy, a special portion of the service which we do to God, and not an exercise to spend the time when one doth wait for another’s coming, till the assembly of them that shall afterwards worship him be complete.”

And then he says, in another passage (book v., sect. 22), “ In our speech of most holy things, our most frail affections

many times are bewrayed. Wherefore when we read or recite the Scripture, we then deliver to the people properly the word of God. As for our sermons, be they never so sound and perfect, his word they are not, as the sermons of the prophets were ; no, they are but ambiguously termed his word, because his word is commonly the subiect whereof they treat, and must be the rule whereby they are framed."

I should wish that authority to be classed with those I have already produced on the subiect of the selection of the Scriptures in the Liturgy.

Now, my lord, going on from the point at which I left off yesterday, I desire to draw your Lordship's attention to certain passages in the Homilies upon the true meaning attached by the Church of England to the word *inspiration*. Before I do so, let me again, in order to prevent all possibility of mistake, say that I understand the argument upon the other side to be this : they say in order to convict Dr. Rowland Williams of teaching a doctrine contrary to the Church of England upon the subiect of *inspiration*, you must contend for *literal inspiration*. That, I believe, is the argument on the other side, to which we reply, we do not contend that *literal inspiration* is the doctrine of the Church of England ; we say it is a pious opinion which English Churchmen are at liberty to hold ; but it is not a necessary doctrine of the Church of England. What we do contend for is, what is called *plenary inspiration*, which I will presently explain in other language than my own. What we do contend for is, that the doctrine of *inspiration* in the Church of England, is one which excludes altogether the view of it which places it on the level of human reason, or on the level of that ordinary *inspiration* of the Holy Ghost to good men who pray for it, according to the statement of our Liturgy. We say both those meanings are clearly excluded by the use of " *inspiration*," according to the forms and declarations of the Church of England when speaking of the prophets. Therefore, in these citations I am about to produce, I am supporting the argument that " *inspiration*," when applied to the Holy Scriptures or the prophets, means an action of the Holy Ghost upon the mind different and distinct—not only different in *degree*, as my friend who spoke last contended, but different in *kind* from that of the ordinary use of the word " *inspiration*."

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen.—I said different not merely in *degree*, but in *object* as well as in *degree*.

Dr. Phillimore.—I think you said different in *degree* but not in *kind*.

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen.—The same process used for a different purpose, and differing in degree, I did not say different in kind; I said the same kind, but for a different object and in a different degree.

Dr. Phillimore.—If you say so, I am sure I am the last person who would wish to pin you down to any statement you might wish to correct. Substantially I think it comes to the same thing. Mr. Stephen says it is a different kind of inspiration. Perhaps I may have to say a word again upon the general argument by and by. I shall contend that though, most wisely, the Church has never given any precise definition of what is “inspiration,” it has nevertheless by necessary consequence excluded such views of inspiration as my learned friends contend for, which would bring it down, when all is explained, to the level of human reason.

In the preface to the Homilies (this preface was published in 1562) it is stated, “considering how necessary it is that the Word of God, which is the only food of the soul, and that most excellent light that we must walk by in this our most dangerous pilgrimage, should at all convenient times be preached unto the people, that thereby they may both learn their duty towards God, their prince, and their neighbours, according to the mind of the Holy Ghost expressed in the Scriptures.” Now the argument on the other side must contend that those words, “according to the mind of the Holy Ghost expressed in the Scriptures,” are identical with “according to the mind of the Holy Ghost as expressed in Luther, or Milton, or Shakspere.”

At page 390 (the Homily is the first part of the information of certain places of the Scripture) there is this passage:—“the ordinary way to attain this knowledge is with diligence to hear and read the Holy Scriptures. For the whole Scriptures, saith St. Paul, were given by the inspiration of God, and shall we Christian men think to learn the knowledge of God and of ourselves in any earthly man’s work or writing sooner or better than in the Holy Scriptures, written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? The Scriptures were not brought unto us by the will of man, but holy men of God, as witnesseth St. Peter, spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit of God.” At page 395, of the same edition, there is a further passage in the same Homily, and in it there is a very remarkable expression. The writer of this Homily speaks with just indignation of the attempt to cast ridicule on Holy Scripture by taking isolated passages from the Scriptures, especially from the Psalms. He takes Psalm Ix.—“Moab is

my washpot, and over Edom will I cast out my shoe," and he says, " Now, I pray you, what uncomely manner of speech is this so used in common phrase among the Hebrews? It is a shame that Christian men should be so lightheaded, to toy as rustians do with such manner of speeches uttered in good, grave signification by the Holy Ghost." Now I may be very incompetent to understand the value and force of words, but I can only say this, that if, for the purpose of my argument, I had been obliged to put down words which would express what I consider the doctrine of the Church, I should have used these expressive terms, viz., "uttered in good, grave signification by the Holy Ghost." At p. 399, in "the second part of information for them which take offence at certain places of the Holy Scripture," he says, "Thus if ye will be profitable hearers and readers of the Holy Scriptures, ye must first deny yourselves, and keep under your carnal senses, taken by the outward words, and search the inward meaning; reason must give place to God's Holy Spirit; you must submit your worldly wisdom and judgment unto his divine wisdom and judgment. Consider that the Scripture, in what strange form soever it be pronounced, is the Word of the living God." At page 403, in the same Homily, and the same part of it, "Christ Jesus, the Prophets, the Apostles, and all the true Ministers of his Word, yea, every jot and tittle in the Holy Scripture have been, is, and shall be for evermore the savour of life unto eternal life, unto all those whose hearts God hath purised by true faith. Let us earnestly take heed that we make no jesting stock of the books of Holy Scriptures, The more obscure and dark the sayings be to our understanding, the further let us think ourselves to be from God and His Holy Spirit, who was the author of them. Let us with more reverence endeavour ourselves to search out the wisdom hidden in the outward bark of the Scripture. If we cannot understand the sense and the reason of the saying yea, let us not be scorers, jesters, and deriders, for that is the uttermost token and show of a reprobate, of a plain enemy to God and his wisdom. They be not idle fables to jest at, which God doth seriously pronounce; and for serious matters let us esteem them."

These, my lord, are the passages on the word 'inspiration,' and on the word identical with it in the Homilies, upon which I would chiefly rely. Theae are other words, to which I will presently direct your lordship's attention, in the same book, on the subject of prophecy. Now, looking at the authority of these citations in a purely legal light, I am sure they will

strike the mind of the Court as being of considerable importance. Not only does the Church especially refer in the Articles to the Homilies, as containing expositions of the Word of God upon which the Church relies, but the Court will bear in mind that by the canons of 1603, when there was great doubt what doctrines would be preached in the pulpit, and whether or no the doctrine which is taught by the Liturgy might not be contradicted by preaching, those canons gave the Ordinary the power of prohibiting even a beneficed clergyman from preaching anything but the Homilies. Therefore, the Homilies must be considered, in any way they are looked at upon questions of doctrine—not speaking of questions of ritual, or of the ornaments or decorations of the Church—upon questions of doctrine, they must certainly be considered as containing a very striking exposition, and (which is of greater importance to my argument) a legal exposition of the mind of the Church.

Upon the question of prophecy, I may as well refer the Court to the authorities in this book upon that point. In page 428 of the same edition, in the sermon on the Nativity, “Afterwards, the selfsame covenant was also more amply and plainly renewed unto Abraham where God promised him, that in his seed all nations and families of the earth should be blessed. Again, it was continued and confirmed unto Isaae in the same form of words as it was before unto his father. And to the intent that mankind might not despair, but always live in hope, Almighty God never ceased to publish, repeat, confirm, and continue the same, by divers and sundry testimonies of his prophets, who, for the better persuasion of the thing,” (these are very remarkable words) “prophesied the time, the place, the manner, and circumstance of his birth, the affliction of his life, the kind of his death, the glory of his resurrection, the receiving of his kingdom, the deliverance of his people, with all other circumstances belonging thereto.”

Then the writer sets out what they are. I find it very difficult to sever in my address the argument as to inspiration, and the argument as to the predictive element in prophecy; they naturally run one into the other, and I must be pardoned if I cannot always keep them distinct. That passage gives us the mind of the Church. It cannot be denied (and I have too much respect for the honesty and understanding of my learned friends to suppose that they will attempt to deny it) that this passage, whatever its value may be, does contain a distinct declaration that the prophecies do contain a predictive element

and historical facts that at least cannot be got rid of by any process of reason or interpretation.

The next passage is in page 441, in the sermon of the Passion for Good Friday : “Then if he be our father indeed, let us give him his due honour. If we be his children, let us show him our obedience, like as Christ openly declared his obedience to his father, which, as St. Paul writeth, was obedient even to the very death—the death of the cross. And this he did for us all that believe in him. For himself he was not punished for he was pure and undefiled of all manner of sin. He was wounded, saith Esay, for our wickedness, and striped for our sins ; he suffered the penalty of them himself, to deliver us from danger. He bare, saith Esay, all our sores and infirmities upon his own back. No pain did he refuse to suffer in his own body, that he might deliver us from pain everlasting.”

The value of this citation is twofold ; upon the general point which pervades the argument, and especially upon the citation from the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, which is distinctly denied in Dr. Williams’s Essay to have any historical bearing on our Saviour.

At page 453, in the second sermon on the Passion, the same prophecy is again referred to : “He, saith the prophet Esay (meaning Christ), hath borne our infirmities, and hath carried our sorrows ; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we were made whole.”

At page 461, in the sermon on the Resurrection : “That these links, therefore, of our faith should all hang together in steadfast establishment and confirmation, it pleased our Saviour not straightway to withdraw himself from the bodily presence and sight of his disciples ; but he chose out forty days, wherein he would declare unto them, by manifold and most strong arguments and tokens, that he had conquered death, and that he was also truly risen again to life.” He began, saith Luke (that is a citation from St. Luke, chap. 24, v. 27), “at Moses and all the prophets, and expounded unto them the prophecies that were written in all the Scriptures of him, to the intent to confirm the truth of his Resurrection long before spoken of, which he verified indeed, as it is declared very apparently and manifestly, by his oft-appearance to sundry persons at sundry times.”

Now I come, I think, to my last citation upon this subject, at p. 448 ; and that is from a homily in which you would expect to find the meaning of the Church upon inspiration laid down more expressly, perhaps, than in any other, because

it is the first part of the sermon for Whit Sunday. Perhaps I had better read the preceding part as to the day of Pentecost: “And here it is to be noted, that as the law was given to the Jews in the Mount Sinai, the fiftieth day after Easter, so was the preaching of the Gospel, through the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, given to the Apostles in the Mount Sion, the fiftieth day after Easter. And hereof this feast hath his name, to be called Pentecost, even of the number of the days. For as St. Luke writeth, in the Acts of the Apostles, when fifty days were come to an end, the disciples being all together with one accord in one place, the Holy Ghost came suddenly among them, and sate upon each of them, like as it had been cloven tongues of fire. Which thing was undoubtedly done, to teach the Apostles, and all other men, that it is he which giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the Gospel, that it is he which openeth the mouth to declare the mighty works of God, that it is he which engendereth a burning zeal towards God’s word, and giveth all men a tongue—yea, a fiery tongue, so that they may boldly and cheerfully profess the truth in the face of the whole world, as Esay was endued with this spirit. The Lord, saith Esay, gave me a learned and a skilful tongue, so that I might know to raise up them that are fallen with the word. The prophet David crieth to have this gift, saying ‘Open thou my lips, O Lord, and my mouth shall show forth thy praise.’ For our Saviour Christ, also in the Gospel, saith to his disciples, ‘It is not you that speak, but the spirit of your Father which is within you.’ All which testimonies of holy Scripture do sufficiently declare that the mystery in the tongues betokeneth the preaching of the Gospel, and the open confession of the Christian faith in all them that are possessed with the Holy Ghost.”

Then the author goes on, and speaks of the attributes of the Holy Spirit. “But that this may appear more sensibly to the eyes of all men, it shall be requisite to come to the other part—namely, to the wonderful and heavenly works of the Holy Ghost, which plainly declare unto the world His mighty and Divine power. First, it is evident that He did wonderfully govern and direct the hearts of the patriarchs and prophets in old time, illuminating their minds with the knowledge of the true Messias, and giving them utterance to prophecy of things that should come to pass long time after. For, as St. Peter witnesseth, the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but the holy men of God spake as they were moved inwardly by the Holy Ghost.”

Now I want to know if this be true doctrine, what is to be

said of a clergyman who expresses himself in this language, whether as a reviewer or as an author. “When so vast an induction on the destructive side has been gone through, it avails little that some passages may be doubtful ; one, perhaps, in Zechariah and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messiahanic, and a chapter possibly in Deuteronomy foreshadowed the final fall of Jerusalem. Even these few cases, the remnant of so much confident rhetorick, tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry. If our German had ignored all that the masters of philology have proved on these subjects, his countrymen would have raised a storm of ridicule, at which he must have drowned himself in the Neckar.” I suppose it will not be contended—indeed I must say it has not been—that the reviewer does not, upon this point, entirely adopt the opinions of his author : and the opinion of his author is that there are no prophecies directly Messianic ; and the opinion of his reviewer is, that if he had said so ridiculous a thing, he would have been dealt with so ignominiously by his enlightened countrymen, that he must have drowned himself in the Neckar.

Well, my lord, those are the passages ; and, for myself, I must confess it seems to me a very hopeless task—if you admit at all that the Homilies are evidence of the legal mind of the Church—to reconcile such passages as these with such teaching as is in this book before me, *Essays and Reviews*.

My lord, I have always a great apprehension and great distrust in these cases of a purely etymological argument ; and when I heard my learned friend, Mr. Stephen, in the course of his very able and very eloquent speech, have recourse to such an argument as this—that “prophet” and “prophecy” did not originally have any connexion with “predicting” or “prediction,” I could not help thinking that he had hardly sufficiently weighed the force of such an argument as that. Almost all words, no doubt, may be used in one or two meanings ; and we all know that, in course of time, words change their meanings very much ; but it would be perfectly ridiculous to press an argument, from mere etymology, against the obvious sense impressed upon a passage from the context. No one would be heard to argue that man might be allowed to call another a “villain,” inasmuch as, according to the etymology of the term, he merely meant that he was a “countryman ;” such an argument would be treated with just ridicule.

My learned friend said he had looked into a very learned work, Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, and he could not find in that book that “prophecy” had any connexion with “prediction.” My friend did not look far enough, I think. I do not attach any value to the argument; but if your lordship will look at *προφητεία* ἡ (προφητευω), you will find it has the meaning of “prediction.”

I. “A foretelling; the gift of prophecy.” (For that a heathen writer is quoted; also the Greek Testament.)

II. A foretelling; the gift of expounding of Scripture; preaching, 1. Tim., i., 18-4, 14. *προφητευω* has, among other meanings, “to prophecy.”

Those are the two meanings, and I need not remind your lordship that Jeremy Taylor's most celebrated work, *The Liberty of Prophecying*, written under peculiar circumstances, had nothing whatever to do with our common meaning of the word “prophecy;” it meant simply a use of the word which was not then obsolete, *i.e.*, “preaching.” It is very often so used in the *Liberty of Prophecying*. He thought at one time that the Church of England ought to have, not that she had the liberty of preaching all doctrines which were not expressly forbidden by the three creeds. That book has been cited; I am not going to refer to it again, but in passing, I make these observations about it. It was written by Jeremy Taylor during the great Rebellion, at a time when his mind (it is well known, and is stated in his life) was greatly influenced by the recent state of political excitement and by the lamentable condition of the Church of England.

Jeremy Taylor argues, that it would have been desirable to have had no subscription Articles of Faith beyond the three creeds. Now, of course no argument can be drawn from that book in favour of that liberty, on behalf of a clergyman who has subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles. The whole scope of the book is directed against any subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and in favour of a plain subscription to the three Creeds. I do not enter into the question, whether he was right or wrong.

My lord, the meaning of “inspiration” also illustrates the position I have just laid down about etymology. Inspiration, no doubt, in its strict sense, only means a “breathing into;” but when anybody speaks of the inspiration of Scripture, we all know that he means more than that—every one knows what is meant by it—*i.e.*, that it has come to be synonymous with a gift of prophetic power. Now, the Greek word in the New Testament which we have translated “inspiration,”

if it had been more literally given, would have prevented that mistake arising, for the word in the Greek Testament is *θεοπνεοστος*,* which means, “breathed by God.”

My lord, I said I would give you what I conceive to be the doctrine of the Church of England in other language than my own, and I prefer doing so in the language of Bishop Van Mildert, because in his *Sermons on the Boyle Lecture*, an institution to which this country is much indebted, he dealt with this subject. Among the sermons which compose those lectures he preached, called the 23rd sermon, in which he took for his text, All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. He begins his sermon by saying, “Every argument brought to prove the truth of revealed religion, may be considered as intended ultimately to establish the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures.” That is the first position which he starts with. Then in a passage at page 392, to which I wish especially to refer, he says, “But before we enter upon the proof of this fact, something is to be premised respecting the extent and degree of inspiration, which we believe to have been bestowed upon the sacred writers.” He says, a little further down, page 393, “In questions which do not admit of reference to our own personal observation and experience, care should be taken to avoid superfluous niceties of discussion. In the present instance, therefore, we need only contend for that kind or degree of inspiration, which may give to the authors of the Bible the proper character of sacred writers, and to their books the general stamp of Divine authority. Where strictly verbal inspiration was necessary to that end, we cannot doubt that verbal inspiration was granted. Where inspiration of the substance of the truths without the verbal expression was sufficient, there we may presume that only so much was actually vouchsafed. But of this we can be but very incompetent judges; nor is it necessary that we should be able to decide upon this point, provided we can, on good grounds, establish the authority and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, collectively considered; so that it may justly be said of them, that they are “the oracles of God,” and “are able,” as the apostle says, “to make us wise unto salvation.” Many, it is to be feared, endeavour to detract from this entire inspiration of the Scriptures, that they may reserve to themselves the liberty of admitting or rejecting particular facts and doctrines in accommodation to their own favourite opinions. But it seems impossible that the Scriptures can answer the purpose

* *πάντα γραφὴ θέοπνευστος.*”—II. Tim., iii., 16.

of a complete rule of faith and practice, unless they are acknowledged to be universally binding, and to be generally delivered by one and the same authority. To suppose a partial inspiration only, is in effect destroying the authority of the whole ; because, as no certain criterion can be fixed, by which to judge what is really inspired, and what is not, one man might reject this portion, and another that, till none were left free from cavil and dispute. The kind of inspiration, therefore, which it is here intended to vindicate, is that which may properly be called a plenary inspiration; denoting by that term that the sacred writers constantly received from the Holy Spirit such a degree of assistance, as might suffice to give to every part of Scripture its sanction and authority as the Word of God. To this end it is not necessary to suppose that the sacred writers were on every occasion favoured with direct communications from above ; but rather, that under a Divine impulse, they at sundry times committed to writing supernatural truths, the knowledge of which, having been previously revealed to them, still remained impressed upon their minds ; and that a further superintendence of the Holy Spirit was vouchsafed for the purpose only of guarding them against any undue mixture of human opinions with those Divine truths. This seems fully sufficient to make the whole Scripture binding upon us, without embarrassing the subject with needless difficulties. For, if this position be established, it will be of little moment whether we can determine in what particular cases (if in any) there was an absolute dictation by the Holy Spirit, or in what the writers were left to express themselves more freely and at will ; since, in either case, the belief of his superintending influence is fully sufficient to warrant us in relying on every part of Scripture, as sanctioned by Divine authority. The probability of such an inspiration cannot be denied. The truth of miracles and prophecies being established, why are we to question the probability of inspiration which is only another species of miracle ? Then he says (to select another passage at 418), “ The substance then of our argument for the plenary inspiration of the Scripture is this : God having bestowed on the writers such extraordinary and supernatural gifts as could only be derived from Him, we cannot but suppose those persons to have been commissioned by Him to declare His will, hence we infer, that in the execution of that purpose, whether by preaching or by writing, He would secure them against important error of every kind by such suggestion, superintendency, or control, as should give to what they delivered the

stamp of Divine authority. And although God might not see fit to supersede the use of their natural talents, or their acquired knowledge, or to infuse into them fresh means of information, when those which they already had were sufficient; yet, since they had received especial tokens of his favour and assistance, and since no rule is afforded us to distinguish between the result of their natural and supernatural powers, we are necessarily led to conclude, that it was the Will of the Almighty, that all their writings should be received as His word. Whatever theories, therefore, we may adopt respecting the mode, the kind, or the degree of inspiration with which they were gifted, we cannot question the Divine authority of these writings without virtually questioning those miraculous evidences by which they were attested.” At page 420, he says, “If the foregoing remarks on the certainty of Scripture inspiration be well founded, it will not be difficult to establish such a criterion as is here demanded. The evidence of miracles or of prophecy has been stated as indispensably necessary to give validity to any claims of inspiration; and with evidence of this kind, no writings, but those of the Bible have ever yet been accompanied. Moses gave ample proofs of his pretensions to this gift, by the miracles which he performed. All the sacred writers, from Moses to Malachi, appeared to have been favoured with some external tokens of the Divine assistance, or, at least, to have received the sanction of those who were so. Every book of the Old Testament is also attested as of Divine authority, by the writers of the New, so that if we are convinced of the inspiration of the latter, no doubt can be entertained of that of the former. But the writers of the New Testament abundantly proved their claim to it, by miracles and prophecies.” He goes on with the argument which I will not trouble your lordship with now. At page 422, he says, “How then can we doubt either of their inspiration, or of the inspiration of all those books which they regarded as of Divine authority; especially when we consider, that among the miraculous gifts bestowed on the apostles, was that of ‘discerning of spirits,’ by which they were enabled to know what teachers or writers made true or false pretensions to this extraordinary illumination? Thus the Divine authority of the whole canon of Scripture is rendered complete; and we are secured against delusion in relying upon it as the Word of God.”

I will now refer your lordship to a work I mentioned yesterday, *Lee on Inspiration*. At page 31, he says, “But whatever may be the result of this distinction, between

revelation and inspiration as applied to the contents of the Bible, in whatever manner we can satisfy ourselves, that certain portions convey to us a message direct from heaven, or that others simply record historical facts which were naturally known to the writers, it must ever be borne in mind that the true idea of inspiration is altogether objective, extending to every portion of every book ; and that, it stamps the Word of God, as such, in the most profound sense of the term, thereby distinguishing it from everything which is merely human. Inspiration, in short, as the attestation of God's Spirit, in, through, and for man, belongs essentially to the organism of Scripture as the record of revelation ; and is at length unfolded to us in its full bearings in that department of it where God reveals himself as the Spirit.” At page 142, he mentions what has been called the “dynamical theory of inspiration. He says, in note 3, after explaining why he does not entirely agree with that theory. “It must be borne in mind, however, that no more than an analogy exists between this ordinary influence of the Holy Ghost upon Christians in general, and that inspiration which prompted and guided the sacred writers. These two agencies of the same spirit, although analogous are specifically distinct.”

Then he states what subjects he will treat of in his fifth lecture.

Before I put down this book, I will refer to a passage in page 398, which has a bearing upon many of the arguments which have been urged in this cause. “Having thus referred to the arguments against the inspiration of Scripture, founded upon the supposed facts that its authors contradict each other, and that they advance statements at variance with the accounts of profane history, it remains to examine the assertion, that the language of the Bible is opposed to many truths which the progress of philosophy has brought to light, unveiling the secrets of nature. The rapid strides with which the material sciences have advanced in our own age, render an examination of this objection more than ever necessary. And I feel particularly called upon to consider what force it may possess, because, as I conceive, the answers usually given to it concede almost everything for which one need care to contend ; the objection may be stated as follows :—The language of Scripture, when touching upon topics which involve allusions to the results of science, is expressed so as to betray complete ignorance of those laws of nature which modern researches have brought to light, and consequently (it is argued), the book in which such ignorance is displayed cannot have been

inspired by the Holy Ghost. The popular form under which the objection is commonly urged will fairly exhibit the force of this argument against inspiration. In this form it was, I believe, first suggested by Spinoza, and it is founded on a principle to which, somewhat differently applied, Galileo was the victim. We read in the Book of Joshua, 'Then spake Joshua to the Lord.....and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon ; and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon, and the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down, about a whole day ;' of which passage it is said, that the motion ascribed by its writer to the sun is in manifest contradiction to an established law of nature. The usual reply to this objection is as follows :—' Your remark is, in point of fact, well founded ; the contradiction which you urge does in reality exist, but Scripture was not intended to teach mankind the conclusions of natural philosophy ; and you are not entitled to expect that its statements on such topics shall be found in accordance with the results of scientific discovery.' To a certain extent, all will admit the force of such an answer, for, as it has been justly said, 'to seek for an exposition of the phenomena of the natural world among the records of the moral destinies of mankind, would be as unwise as to look for rules of moral government in a treatise on chemistry.' But I altogether deny that the concession implied, at the same time, in such an answer, namely, that there does exist a real contradiction between this statement of the Book of Joshua and the results of science, is justified by anything in the sacred narrative. Let us examine more nearly the bearing of the objection, as well as the cause which has produced in the language of Scripture even a semblance of opposition to physical facts."

There is an author, who has been very much cited in the course of this argument, for whom I, in common with the rest of my fellow-countrymen, at all events I may say in common with every educated man, entertain the highest respect, and that is the authority of Hooker. I have listened with very great surprise to a statement of the tenets which his work is supposed to support. I have heard him cited as proving that a man's reason is an inspiration in the sense in which that word is applied to the Holy Scriptures, and that you must apply reason to bring inspiration to the test of the truth. Such has been the substance of certain observations made as to Hooker, and said to be gathered from one or two isolated

passages. I must take the liberty of saying, at the outset, that it would be a contradiction to the whole object and intent of his work if he had ever so expressed himself, and to fully refute such an assertion as that, would require a study of all the books of the Ecclesiastical polity ; but there are one or two passages bearing on this subject generally, and also on the particular point on which I am now addressing you, to which I will refer. I may as well deal with both points together. On this point of reason being sufficient to judge of Revelation, and being a kind of inspiration, he says, in his Second book of Ecclesiastical Polity (section 8, page 264, of the edition I am reading from, that is, the two volume edition published in London in 1825) :—“ In actions of this sort the very light of nature alone may discover ” (he is speaking of certain texts) “ ‘ no man hateth his own flesh ; ’ ‘ If ye do good unto them that do so to you, the very publicans themselves do as much ; ’ ‘ They are worse than infidels that have no care to provide for their own ; ’ which is so far forth in the sight of God allowable. Some things in such sort are allowed, that they be also required as necessary unto salvation, by way of direct, immediate, and proper necessity, final ; so that without performance of them we cannot by ordinary course be saved, nor by any means be excluded from life observing them. In actions of this kind our chiefest direction is from Scripture, for nature is no sufficient teacher what we should do that we may attain unto life everlasting. The insufficiency of the light of nature is by the light of Scripture so fully and so perfectly herein supplied, that further light than this hath added, there doth not need unto that end.” In the third book, and the 3rd section, he begins with a maxim which it would be well for everybody to remember. “ The mixture of those things by speech, which by nature are divided, is the mother of all error.” And then he goes on to say, “ What the Church of God standeth bound to know or do, the same in part nature teacheth. And because nature can teach them but only in part, neither so fully as is requisite for man’s salvation, nor so early as to make the way plain, and expedite enough that many may come to the knowledge of it, and so be saved, therefore, in Scripture, hath God both collected the most necessary things that the school of nature teacheth unto that end, and revealeth also whatsoever we neither could with safety be ignorant of, nor at all be instructed in, but by supernatural revelation from him.” Then, in section 8 of the same book, he says, “ Sixthly, if I believe the Gospel, there needeth no reasoning about it to persuade me ; if I do not believe, it

must be the Spirit of God, and not the reason of man, that shall convert my heart unto him.” He is taking that objection, that argument. “By these and the like disputes, an opinion hath spread itself very far in the world, as if the way to be ripe in faith were to be raw in wit and judgment, as if reason were an enemy unto religion, childish simplicity the mother of ghostly and divine wisdom. The cause why such declamations prevail so greatly is, for that men suffer themselves in two respects to be deluded: one is, that the wisdom of man being debased, either in comparison with that of God, or in regard of some special thing exceeding the reach and compass thereof, it seemeth to them (not marking so much) as if simply it were condemned. Another, that learning, knowledge, or wisdom, falsely so termed, usurping a name whereof they are not worthy, and being under that name controlled, their reproof is by so much the more easily misapplied, and through equivocation wrested against those things whereunto so precious names do properly and of right belong.” Then he says, for plainer and fuller explanation, there comes this passage: “First, concerning the inability of reason to search out and to judge of things divine, if they be such as those properties of God, and those duties of men towards him, which may be conceived by attentive consideration of heaven and earth, we know that of mere natural men the Apostle testifieth, how they knew both God and the law of God. Other things of God there be, which are neither so found, nor, though they be showed, can ever be approved without the special operation of God’s good Grace and Spirit. Of such things sometime spake the Apostle St. Paul, declaring how Christ had called him to be a witness of his death and resurrection from the dead, according to that which the prophets and Moses had foreshowed. Festus, a mere natural man, an infidel, a Roman, one whose ears were unacquainted with such matter, heard him, but could not reach unto that whereof he spake; the suffering and the rising of Christ from the dead, he rejected as idle, superstitious fancies not worth the hearing. The Apostle that knew them by the Spirit, and spake of them with power by the Holy Ghost, seemed in his eyes but learnedly mad. Which example maketh manifest, what elsewhere the same Apostle teacheth, namely, that nature hath need of grace, whereunto I hope we are not opposite, by holding that grace hath use of nature.” Then there is another passage, which I will now refer to, without reading at length under the head of “fourthly,” in the same paragraph, to the same effect; and there is one more upon this point which I do not wish to

pass by ; it is under the “sixthly” of the same paragraph. He says, speaking of the address to King Agrippa, “ King Agrippa, believeth thou the prophets ? I know thou dost.” “ The question is, how the books of the prophets came to be credited of King Agrippa, for what with him did authorize the prophets, the like with us doth cause the rest of the Scripture of God to be of credit, because we maintain that in Scripture we are taught all things necessary unto salvation ; hereupon very childishly it is by some demanded, what Scripture can teach us the sacred authority of the Scripture upon the knowledge whereof our whole faith and salvation dependeth ? as though there were any kind of science in the world which leadeth men unto knowledge without presupposing a number of things already known. No science doth make known the first principles whereon it buildeth, but they are always either taken as plain and manifest in themselves, or as proved and granted already, some former knowledge having made them evident. Scripture teacheth all supernatural revealed truth, without the knowledge whereof salvation cannot be attained. The main principle whereupon our belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the Scriptures are the oracles of God himself. This in itself we cannot say is evident, for then all men that hear it would acknowledge it in heart as they do when they hear that every whole is more than any part of that whole.” Then he goes on to say, “ Scripture teacheth us that saving truth which God hath discovered unto the world by Revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise that itself is divine and sacred.” Then he shows the tradition of the Church. What is that ? “ For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing for any man bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards, the more we bestow our labour in reading, or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it.” In the fifth book, section 19, is the passage which I have already read for another purpose, to show with what objects the selection of Scripture were put into the Prayer Book. I refer to it here again, without citing the passage at length. I might draw your lordship’s attention to the several passages in this great writer’s work from which his own opinion upon inspiration in the great work of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* may be very safely collected, but I think I have found a compendium of that which will save the necessity of reading a great many passages. I am referring to another work of his—two

Sermons on part of St. Jude's Epistle. These Sermons are usually printed at the end of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. At page 588 (of the second volume of the edition which I have cited), there are these words. It is the first Sermon, and the second paragraph. He is speaking of what the Apostle has described in Phillipians, iii., and he says, "These were enemies to the Cross of Christ, enemies whom he saw, and his eyes gushed out with tears to behold them. But we are taught in this place how the Apostle spake also of enemies, whom as yet they had not seen described, a family of men as yet unheard of, a generation reserved for the end of the world, and for the last time they had not only declared what they heard and saw in the days wherein they lived, but they have prophesied also in time to come, and you do well (saith St. Peter) in that you take heed to prophecy, so that ye first know this, that no prophecy in the Scripture cometh of any man's own resolution. No prophecy in Scripture cometh of any man's own resolution, for all prophecy which is in Scripture came by the secret inspiration of God. But there are prophecies which are no Scripture, yea, there are prophecies against the Scripture, my brethren—beware of such prophecies, and take heed that you heed them not. Remember the things that were spoken of before, but spoken of before by the Apostles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Take heed to prophecies, but to prophecies which are in Scripture, for both the manner and matter of those prophecies do show plainly that they are of God."

Then there follows this passage, "Touching the manner how men by the spirit of prophecy in the Holy Scripture have spoken and written of things to come, we must understand, that as the knowledge of that they spake, so likewise the utterance of that they knew, came not by these usual and ordinary means, whereby we are brought to understand the mysteries of our salvation, and are wont to instruct others in the same. For whatsoever we know, we have it by the hands and ministry of men, which lead us along like children from a letter to a syllable, from a syllable to a word, from a word to a line, from a line to a sentence, from a sentence to a side, and so turn over. But God Himself was their instructor; He Himself taught them, partly by dreams and visions in the night, partly by revelations in the day, taking them aside from amongst their brethren, and talking with them as a man would talk with his neighbour in the way. Thus they became acquainted even with the secret and hidden counsels of God, they saw things which themselves were not able to utter, they beheld that whereat men and angels are astonished, they

understood in the beginning what should come to pass in the last days."

My lord, another authority certainly equal—in some men's opinion even superior—to that of Hooker, was the authority of Butler. I must say, I was astonished to see him also pressed into the service. The passage I am about to read, will, I think, dispose altogether of the notion for which he was cited as an authority, viz., that he supports the opinions of Dr. Rowland Williams, on the subject of prophecy. It is in *The Credibility of Revelation Liable to Objections*, chapter ii., part 3, of the *Analogy*. "These observations relating to the whole of Christianity, are applicable to inspiration in particular. As we are in no sort judges beforehand, by what laws or rules, in what degree, or by what means, it were to have been expected, that God would naturally instruct us; so upon supposition of his affording us light and instruction by revelation, additional to what he has afforded us by reason and experience, we are in no sort judges, by what methods, and in what proportion, it were to be expected that this supernatural light and instruction would be afforded us. We know not beforehand, what degree or kind of natural information it were to be expected God would afford men, each by his own reason and experience, nor how far he would enable and effectually dispose them to communicate it, whatever it should be, to each other, nor whether the evidence of it would be certain, highly probable, or doubtful; nor whether it would be given with equal clearness and conviction to all. Nor could we guess, upon any good ground I mean, whether natural knowledge, or even the faculty itself, by which we are capable of attaining it, reason would be given us at once, or gradually. In like manner, we are wholly ignorant what degree of new knowledge it were to be expected God would give mankind by revelation, upon supposition of his affording one; or how far, or in what way, he would interpose miraculously, to qualify them, to whom he should originally make the revelation, for communicating the knowledge given by it; and to secure their doing it to the age in which they should live; and to secure its being transmitted to posterity. We are equally ignorant whether the evidence of it would be certain, or highly probable, or doubtful, or whether all who should have any degree of instruction from it, and any degree of evidence of its truth would have the same, or whether the scheme would be revealed at once, or unfolded gradually. Then he goes on on that argument, and he says, "Now, since it has been shown that we have no principles of reason upon which to judge before-

hand, how it were to be expected revelation should have been left, or what was most suitable to the Divine plan of government in any of the forementioned respects, it must be quite frivolous to object afterwards as to any of them against its being left in one way rather than another, for this would be to object against things upon account of their being different from expectations which have been shown to be without reason. And thus we see that the only question concerning the truth of Christianity is, whether it be a real revelation, not whether it be attended with every circumstance which we should have looked for, and concerning the authority of Scripture, whether it be what it claims to be not, whether it be a book of such sort, and so promulgated, as weak men are apt to fancy a book containing a Divine revelation should. And therefore neither obscurity, nor seeming inaccuracy of style, nor various readings, nor early disputes about the authors of particular parts, nor any other things of the like kind, though they had been much more considerable in degree than they are, could overthrow the authority of the Scripture, unless the prophets, apostles, or our Lord had promised that the book containing the Divine revelation should be secure from those things. Nor indeed can any objections overthrow such a kind of revelation as the Christian claims to be, since there are no objections against the morality of it, but such as can show that there is no proof of miracles wrought originally in attestation of it." Then he goes on a little further, and says, "From the foregoing observations, too, it will follow, and those who will thoroughly examine into revelation, will find it worth remarking, that there are several ways of arguing, which though just with regard to other writings, are not applicable to Scripture, at least not to the prophetic parts of it. We cannot argue, for instance, that this cannot be the sense or intent of such a passage of Scripture, for if it had, it would have been expressed more plainly, or have been represented under a more apt figure or hieroglyphic, yet we may justly argue thus with respect to common books. And the reason of this difference is very evident, that in Scripture, we are not competent judges as we are in common books, how plainly it were to have been expected, what is the true sense should have been expressed, or under how apt an image figured. The only question is, what appearance there is that this is that this is the sense, and scarce at all how much more determinately or accurately it might have been expressed or figured." Now, in that passage, he most distinctly expresses his opinion that the Scripture is not like common books, to be criticised, as it is contended in these

articles that it is, and he also most distinctly draws the difference between supernatural light and revelation, and the reason of man. At page 252, part ii., section 7, upon "prophecy," he says, "There are two kinds of writing which bear a great resemblance to prophecy, with respect to the matter before us, the mythological and the satirical, where the satire is to a certain degree concealed." Then he deals with that part of his subject, and says, "And though in all just way of consideration, the appearing completion of prophecies is to be allowed to be thus explanatory of, and to determine, their meaning; yet it is to be remembered farther, that the ancient Jews applied the prophecies to a Messiah before His coming, in much the same manner as Christians do now; and that the primitive Christians interpreted the prophecies respecting the state of the Church, and of the world in the last ages in the sense which the event seems to confirm and verify. And from these things it may be made appear. 3. That the showing even to a high probability if that could be." I may as well state, my lord, I do not know whether it was an objection actually expressed in words, but it was hinted at that it was incumbent upon us to contend that the prophet in his prophecy had only one object before him, and that, the supernatural object so to speak. Now, that has never, that I am aware of, been contended for. In many instances, there is no doubt there was a primary and a secondary sense of the prophecy. What we state is this, that in no part of Dr. Rowland Williams's Essay, is there any acknowledgment whatever of the supernatural sense of the prophecy, viz., that he in no part of his essay admits that the prophet, so to speak, foretold. He says he was an historian of cotemporaneous events, and that in no respect did he foretell an actual fact. Bishop Butler dealing with an argument of this kind, says, "The showing even to a high probability, if that could be, that the prophets thought of some other events in such predictions, and not those at all which Christians allege to be completions of those predictions, or that such and such prophecies are capable of being applied to other events than those to which Christians would apply them. This would not confute or destroy the force of the argument from prophecy even with regard to those very instances. For observe how this matter really is. If one knew such a person to be the sole author of such a book, and was certainly assured or satisfied to any degree, that one knew the whole of what he intended in it, one should be assured or satisfied to such degree, that one knew the whole meaning of that book; for the meaning of a book is nothing but the meaning of the author. But if

one knew a person to have compiled a book out of memoirs, which he received from another, of vastly superior knowledge in the subject of it, especially if it were a book full of great intricacies and difficulties, it would in no wise follow that one knew the whole meaning of the book, from knowing the whole meaning of the compiler for the original memoirs, *i.e.*, the author of them might have, and there would be no degree of presumption in any cases against supposing him to have, some further meaning than the compiler saw."

Now comes a passage to which I would direct the Court's attention. "To say, then, that the Scriptures, and the things contained in them, can have no other or further meaning than those persons thought or had, who first recited or wrote them, is evidently saying that those persons were the original, proper, and sole authors of those books, *i.e.*, that they are not inspired, which is absurd, whilst the authority of these books is under examination, *i.e.*, till you have determined they are of no Divine authority at all."

Then he says, a little lower down, "Hence may be seen to how little purpose those persons busy themselves, who endeavour to prove that the prophetic history is applicable to events of the age in which it was written, or of ages before it. Indeed, to have proved this, before there was any appearance of a farther completion of it, might have answered some purpose, for it might have prevented the expectation of any such farther completion." And then he comes to deal with the ancient heresy which is revived in this book, and which may be said to have been adopted in the third century after our Lord, the heresy of Porphyry about Daniel. He says, "Thus could Porphyry have shown that some principal parts of the Book of Daniel for instance, the seventh verse of the seventh chapter, which the Christians interpreted of the latter ages, was applicable to events which happened before or about the age of Antiochus Epiphanes; this might have prevented them from expecting any further completion of it. And unless there was then, as I think there must have been, external evidence concerning that book, more than is come down to us, such a discovery might have been a stumbling-block in the way of Christianity itself. Why?—It is important to know, because this prophecy of Daniel is distinctly denied in this review by Dr. Rowland Williams. Why might it then have been a stumbling-block in the way of Christianity itself? "Why," says Bishop Butler, "considering the authority which our Saviour has given to the book of Daniel, and how much the general scheme

of Christianity presupposes the truth of it. But even this discovery, had there been any such, would be of very little weight with reasonable men now; if this passage, thus applicable to events before the age of Porphyry, appears to be applicable also to events which succeeded the dissolution of the Roman Empire. I mention this, not at all as intending to insinuate that the division of this empire into ten parts, for it plainly was divided into about that number, were, alone and by itself, of any moment in verifying the prophetic history—but only as an example of the thing I am speaking of; and thus, upon the whole”—I skip a passage—“the matter of inquiry evidently must be, as above put—Whether the prophecies are applicable to Christ, and to the present state of the world and of the Church: applicable in such a degree as to imply foresight, not whether they are capable of any other applications, though I know no pretence for saying the general turn of them is capable of any other.” The inference, therefore, which I seek to draw from those passages of Butler, which I have read, is, that they utterly destroy the notion that he is any authority whatever for the positions maintained by Dr. Williams. He distinctly holds inspiration different, not in degree, but in kind, from reason. He distinctly holds, even in this work, the analogy—which was not like the delivery of his opinions in a sermon, but where he was putting his argument for the purpose of dealing with his adversary on the lowest possible ground—he distinctly holds that the Holy Scriptures were inspired, and that to deny the authority of this particular book of Daniel would be to deny the authority of our Lord, and to put in jeopardy, by necessary consequence, the whole system of Christianity.

My lord, my next quotation is from Barrow on the *Divinity of the Holy Ghost*, sermon 34, section 1: “First it his especial work”—that is, the Holy Ghost—“to declare God’s mind to us: whence he is styled the Spirit of Truth, the Spirit of Prophecy, the Spirit of Revelation, for that all supernatural light or wisdom have ever proceeded from Him. He instructed all the prophets that have been since the world began to know, he enabled them to speak the mind of God concerning all things present and future. Holy men, that have taught men their duty and led them in the way to bliss, were but his instruments speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. By his inspiration, the Holy Scripture, the most full and certain witness of God’s mind, the law and testimony by which our life is to be directed and regulated, were conceived. He guided the Apostles into all truth.” He says, “All the

knowledge we can pretend to in these things, doth proceed merely from his revelation, doth wholly rely upon his authority."

My lord, Burnet, in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, cannot be passed over. He is speaking on the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to Salvation. It is the article, in fact, on the canonical Scriptures. I am reading from an edition published at Oxford in 1831, and I am citing from page 106. "From thence, without any further proof, we may be convinced of the canon of the Old Testament. Christ does frequently cite Moses and the Prophets; he appeals to them; and though he charged the Jews of that time, chiefly their teachers and rulers, with many disorders and faults, yet he never once so much as insinuated that they had corrupted their law or other sacred books, which, if true, had been the greatest of all those abuses that they had put upon the people. Our Saviour cited their books according to the translation that was then in credit and common use amongst them." That is the Septuagint, of course. "When one asked him which was the great commandment, he answered, 'How readest thou?' And he proved the chief things relating to himself, his death, and resurrection, from the prophecies that had gone before, which ought to have been fulfilled in him. He also cites the Old Testament by a threefold division of the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms: according to the three orders of books into which the Jews had divided it. The Psalms, which was the first among the holy writings, being set for that whole volume. St. Paul says that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God; he reckons that among the chief of their privileges, but he never blames them for being unfaithful in this trust; and it is certain that the Jews have not corrupted the chief of those passages, that we urged against them, to prove Jesus to have been the Christ. So that the Old Testament, at least the translation of the seventy interpreters, which was in common use and in high esteem among the Jews in our Saviour's time was, as to the main, faithful and uncorrupted. This might be further urged from what St. Paul says concerning those Scriptures which Timothy had learned of a child. These could be no other than the books of the Old Testament. Thus, if the writings of the New Testament are acknowledged to be of Divine authority, the full testimony that they give to the books of the Old Testament does sufficiently prove their authority and genuineness likewise." Then he goes on with a further argument on that. Now that is precisely the dilemma put by Bishop Chandler, to which I referred yesterday. It is

stated here in these words: “If the writings of the New Testament are acknowledged to be of Divine authority, the full testimony that they give to the books of the Old Testament, does sufficiently prove their authority and genuineness likewise.

My lord, there is a little book which has been published since this controversy began, written by a very learned person—written with a view, no doubt, to this controversy ; and, therefore, open to any objection which may be taken on that ground—to contradict the heresies contained in this essay. It is a little book called *The Inspiration of the Bible*, in five lectures, delivered in Westminster Abbey, by Christopher Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster, and at page 68 he expresses himself in this way: “Is the Old Testament true? is it from Heaven? is it all true? is it all inspired? These questions are now current amongst us. Books are put into our hands, written, it would seem, by shrewd men, distinguished by literary attainments, and by philosophic calmness and research ; who appear to have inquired with candour and impartiality into the evidences of the truth and inspiration of the Old Testament, and not to have been convinced that it is of Divine origin. We hear it alleged by some, that it can be shown from recent investigations of geologists, that the world must have existed before the date assigned to the Creation by the book of Genesis. We hear it argued by others, who seem to be proficients in the study of morals and metaphysics, that to believe all mankind to have been involved in guilt by the sin of Adam and Eve, is hardly consistent with the reverence due to the justice and benevolence of God ; and that it is derogatory to his wisdom and foresight, to suppose that he should have destroyed his own work of Creation by the general devastation of the Flood. What, they ask, are we to say of such seemingly strange and incredible narratives as those which are found in the Old Testament, concerning the speaking of Balaam’s ass and the coming forth of the prophet Jonah from the whale’s belly after three days? What are we to think of these things? Again, it is said by some persons of high reputation among us, reviving the sceptical objections of Porphyry, which were exploded by St. Jerome fourteen hundred years ago, that the prophecies of Daniel bear marks of having been composed after the events which they profess to foretell, and, in fact, are no prophecies at all. To those who may make these, and all such allegations as these, impugning the truth, genuineness, or inspiration of the Old Testament, we would put this

question—Whom shall we believe; you, or Jesus Christ? You allege that there are certain things in the Old Testament which you cannot reconcile with the results of your physical researches, or with your moral and metaphysical theories; and you, therefore, reject the Old Testament, and require us to surrender it in deference to your authority. But in this great question—in this most momentous question of eternal life or eternal death—we ask again, whom shall we believe, whom shall we follow? You, or Jesus Christ? Shall we imagine that you, the creatures of a day, have a clearer insight into the laws of nature than He who made the worlds, and who controlled the laws of nature by the utterance of a single word." And then the writer goes on to apply further the same argument, and he says with regard to the history of Jonah (which I shall have to deal with), with regard to the history of Balaam, and with regard to the history of Daniel especially, that they were all acknowledged as genuine by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Especially I would mention here, to save my citing the authority again, that both the Miracle of Jonah and the Prophecies of Daniel are impugned in the review of Dr. Williams. Therefore, I will read this to save the necessity of doing so again when I touch upon those passages of the review. "Thus again," Dr. Wordsworth says, "as to the history of Jonah in the whale's belly, it may be a difficulty with some, but in reading that history, every Christian student, who believes and adores his Blessed Redeemer, will recollect that Jesus Christ has adopted and authenticated that history, and has applied and appropriated it to Himself. 'As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so (says Christ) shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' The Christian reader will observe that Christ's reference to the history of Jonah is interwoven with Christ's prophecy concerning himself; and he will remember that Christ's word was proved to be true by the fulfilment of that prophecy. Christ was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, and he then raised himself. Thus Christ's authorization of Jonah's history is verified by the fulfilment of Christ's prophecy concerning himself, of whom Jonah was a type. Let us not read the history of Jonah by the feeble glimmerings of a purblind sciolism, but by the clear light of Christ's glorious Gospel, and we shall see the proof of its truth in His burial and resurrection. Thus these Scriptural difficulties are dissolved by a spiritual alchymy in the crucible of faith.

“Once more the unbeliever may allege that the prophecies of Daniel correspond so minutely with the events that they profess to predict that they must be posterior to those events. A strange allegation! As if there were any past or future with God; as if He, who spake by the prophets, does not see all things present at once. It is enough for us to know that the Book of Daniel, as it is in our hands now, was in the hands of the Jewish nation of our Lord’s age, and was received by them as inspired, and that what they received as inspired, was also received as such by Jesus Christ. Indeed, he expressly owns Daniel as a prophet. ‘When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet.’ Daniel the prophet may be no prophet to the unbeliever; the book of Daniel may be a forgery to the sceptic of the nineteenth century; but to us, my Christian friends, let him be Daniel the prophet, for he was Daniel the prophet to his own nation, he was Daniel the prophet to Jesus Christ.” I take the liberty of adding to that remark that he must be Daniel the prophet to a clergyman of the Church of England, so long at least as he subscribes to the thirty-nine Articles.

My lord, there is an explanation of inspiration given by Archbishop Tillotson, which I do not like to pass over. It will be found in the 19th or 12th volume, as they may happen to be bound up, and page 100. It is upon the text of the faith or persuasion of a Divine revelation. “But without faith it is impossible to please God,” and it is the fourth sermon and the second paragraph. “The question is, what assurance miracles give that those persons who are said to be the penmen of the books of Scripture were divinely inspired.”

It is important to see how these two matters are put on the same grounds by all eminent divines. “The miracles (under which I comprehend the prediction of future events) which Moses, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, wrought, were testimonies from Heaven that they were Divine persons, and that what they said was to be credited, and consequently if they gave out themselves for such, that they were such.” Then he deals with that matter. Then he says, “That the penmen of the New Testament were persons endued with a miraculous power, is plain, because they were most of them Apostles, and for the rest we have no reason to doubt of it; those extraordinary gifts being so common in the primitive times. However, so long as there is nothing in the rest that is dissonant from, or contrary to, what those wrote, of whose inspiration we are assured, and these their ‘writing having always been received in the Church,’ as of Divine inspiration,

which we may well presume was not rashly done, and without grounds we have no reason to doubt as to them; or if they were, so long as they contain nothing that is contrary to those who were unquestionably inspired, the matter is of no dangerous consequence; and as for the penmen of the Old Testament, we are assured that they were all inspired by one in the New Testament that was unquestionably so, St. Paul, who tells us that all Scripture is of Divine inspiration, meaning the books of the Old Testament which were called by that name *καγ' ἐξοχῆς*, or by way of eminency. But if any one inquire farther how far the penmen of Scripture were inspired in the writing of those books, whether only so far as to be secured from mistake in the delivery of any message or doctrine from God, or in the relation of any history or matter of fact, yet so as they were left every man to his own style and manner of expression, or that everything they wrote was immediately dictated to them, and that not only the sense of it, but the very words and phrases by which they express things, and that they were merely instruments or penmen, I shall not take upon me to determine. I shall only say this in general, that considering the end of this inspiration, which was to inform the world certainly of the mind and will of God, it is necessary for every man to believe that the inspired penmen of Scripture were so far assisted as was necessary to this end; and he that thinks upon good grounds that this end cannot be secured unless every word and syllable were immediately dictated, he had reason to believe it was so; but if any man upon good grounds thinks the end of writing the Scripture may be sufficiently secured without that, he hath no reason to conclude that God, who is not wanting in what is necessary, is guilty of doing what is superfluous. And if any man is of opinion that Moses might write the history of those actions which he himself did or was present at, without an immediate revelation of them; or that Solomon, by his natural and acquired wisdom, might speak those wise sayings which are in his proverbs, or the Evangelists might write what they heard and saw, or what they had good assurance of from others, as St. Luke tells he did; or that St. Paul might write for his cloak and parchments at Troas, and salute by name his friends and brethren; or that he might advise Timothy to drink a little wine, &c., without the immediate dictate of the Spirit of God, he seems to have reason on his side. For that men may, without an immediate revelation, write those things which they think, without a revelation, seems very plain. And that they did so, there is this probable argument for it, because we

find the Evangelists, in relating the discourses of Christ, are very far from agreeing in the particular expressions and words, though they do agree in the substance of the discourses ; but if the words had been dictated by the Spirit of God, they must have agreed in them. For when St. Luke differs from St. Matthew, in relating what our Saviour did, it is impossible that they should both relate it right, as to the very words and forms of expression ; but they both relate the substance of what he said. And if it had been of concernment that everything that they wrote should be dictated *ad apicem* to a tittle, by the Spirit of God, it is of the same concernment to state that the providence of God should have secured the Scriptures since to a tittle from the least alteration, which that it is not done, appears by the various readings both of the Old and New Testament, concerning which no man can infallibly say that this is right and not the other.” Then he winds up with these observations. “ It seems sufficient in this matter to assert that the Spirit of God did reveal to the penmen of the Scriptures what was necessary to be revealed ; and as to all other things, that he did superintend them in the writing of it so far as to secure them from any material error or mistake in which they have delivered.” I thought it right to read that passage to your lordship, coming as it does from Archbishop Tillotson, and it contains the very least strong statement, if I may use the expression, on the subject of inspiration, that I think can be found in any clerical writer. And yet your lordship will most clearly observe how distinct the position of that writer is from that which is contended for as lawful in the essay of Dr. Rowland Williams. It would be quite inconsistent with the opinion there expressed by Archbishop Tillotson, that the sacred writers should have been mistaken as to the history of Abraham, as to the facts recorded by Abraham, as to the prophecy of Daniel, or as to the prophecy of Jonah ; such positions would be quite inconsistent with the view of Archbishop Tillotson. He does not go very much further on that point than Bishop Bull does in his sermon on the cloak and parchments which were left at Troas, in which he says that it is a perfectly lawful opinion to hold that there were passages which were not directly dictated by the Holy Ghost, though there was no passage which could by possibility contain a falsehood and although every material fact was unquestionably inspired by the Holy Spirit.

My lord, if you bring those commentaries to bear on the construction of the article it places it very much in the light in which I originally endeavoured to put it before your lord-

ship. It shows that such a license as is claimed here, viz. : of saying this or that narrative is altogether a human fiction, this or that account in Scripture when the words are used, "God said so and so," or (confining it to the one which is more immediately before the Court,) "God did tempt Abraham," that it would be utterly inconsistent with any view that any writer in the Church of England of eminence, or not of eminence, has ever held to bring that within the notion of inspiration ascribed to Scripture; I may again repeat what I said yesterday, that in not one single author which has been cited out of the immense catalogue produced before the Court, is such a position to be found.

Now, my lord, Dr. Tait, the Bishop of London, was cited by my learned friend, in a book called *Dangers and Safeguards*, and there was a short passage in it which I should like to add to that which my learned friends read, and then I will leave it with some confidence in your lordship's hands, to say whether that furnishes any authority for the teaching of Dr. Williams. At page 9, of that book, you will find this passage, "Of course if a man hangs so lightly to the faith of the Lord Jesus and the Apostles, that he looks on the Bible as on Homer or Herodotus, the whole aspect of our controversy with him is changed; he cannot then be supposed to be arguing within the Church of England, nor within the limits of the Christianity of the Apostles, or of Christ. We must arrange our argument on quite different grounds; but if he allows that there is such a thing as what the Lord and his Apostles called Scripture, and that the Old and New Testaments are that Scripture, then we ask him to remember that Scripture is the word of God." If, my lord, we substitute for Homer or Herodotus, Luther or Milton, does it make any very great difference in the argument? The case taken by Dr. Williams, is Luther or Milton; the case put by Dr. Tait, is Homer or Herodotus. I do not not think, my lord, his authority in this work can be cited against his subscription to that unanimous declaration of the English Episcopate which I read to you.

My lord, considering the general tone of this Essay, and the subject which it reviews, it becomes, I think, of importance, and it becomes germane to the legal inquiry now instituted before your lordship, to see whether the kind of literature which is so earnestly recommended in these pages be, or be not wholly, and entirely inconsistent with the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the Formularies of the Church. The book itself is a review of three works by the distinguished gentleman Baron Bunsen. One is *Of Egypt's Place in History*,

one is *God in History*, and the other is *Hippolytus*. Now, as Dr. Williams himself admits, Baron Bunsen is not bound to the Thirty-nine Articles, and he may say a great many things therefore which Dr. Williams is restrained from being able to publish; but it is unfortunate that in those books all the historical facts of revelation are more or less denied. If I may use an expression that the Germans have introduced, there remains the terminology of revelation; there remain expressions of regard for the Holy Scriptures, great admiration for the morality and philosophy of our Lord, great admiration for the moral element in the prophecies; but all the facts out of which these attributes are deduced by our Divines, and by the Catholic Church generally, are put in issue. I have been brought up in the teaching that the gospel's doctrine is derived from its history; that it is not a series of precepts or moral maxims, but that it is God's teaching by act, example, and practice; teaching in the concrete not in the abstract, if I may so speak. To deny the story of Moses altogether, to deny the story of Abraham, to deny the prophecies of Isaiah, Daniel, and Jonah; to deny that such persons ever lived, or that such facts did take place, but to say that there is a moral residue, so to speak, which is very valuable, is, in our common and plain English understanding, to deny the Bible. Now, I say, that it is unfortunate that the books so reviewed should have led to those conclusions. First, the history of the Old Testament is denied, then the predictive element in the prophecies is denied, then the miracles of the New Testament are denied, then all the great events of our Saviour's life are dramatised and spiritualised, and (I do not know what word exactly to invent) rationalised, as my learned friend suggests, and allegorised away, until you are left with a bundle of poems, and songs, and myths, and maxims, and no living being, or creature whatever, no actual fact connected with the Bible. It is unfortunate that a person holding a cure of souls in England, should have reviewed works of that description without passing censure upon such opinions. It is more unfortunate that he should have praised almost indiscriminately all those works, and it is most unfortunate that he should so have blended his own opinions with them, that it is not until his advocate rises in Court, that it is suggested that the words so used, and which bear an obvious sense *prima facie*, must be totally changed before you can understand Dr. Williams' meaning, that is to say, before you can bring him within the liberties of the Formularies, and take him out of the license in which he has really indulged.

Now, my lord, I make these general remarks, because I think it my duty; I am very reluctant to do so, but I think it my duty to draw your lordship's attention (I will do so as shortly as I can) generally to the system of the so called German divinity, which it is intended, as I contend, to import into the teaching of the English ministry, and which I find expressed here in this preface. "An attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling in a becoming spirit of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment." Those ambiguous words taken with this review together, must, in common sense and common fairness, be interpreted as showing the intention of the writer to depart from some ancient track, from some traditional method, and what they call "conventional language," and to introduce a new system. Now, though the Bishop of Salisbury, whom I unworthily represent, is the last person to wish to restrain the exercise of the reason of his clergy in any manner connected with criticism, or interpretation, or inquiries appertaining to historical research, or physical science; yet I am here on his behalf, to say, that, if, under the guise of those fair-seeming words it be intended to rationalise away all the historical facts of Scripture, and leave us with this bundle of lifeless moral maxims, that that is a system of teaching which it is his bounden duty, as at present advised, not to permit within his diocese.

Now, my lord, I must show you that this *Bunsen's Biblical Researches*, and this *God in Egypt*, and this *Hippolytus*, are a sequel of a train of reasoning of a particular school, which it will be impossible, with any fairness, not to consider as diametrically opposite to the teaching of the Church of England.

Dr. Deane.—I have not the least wish to interrupt my learned friend. I thought we were discussing the admissibility of certain articles bearing on points found from page 51 to page 92. I have no hesitation in saying at once, that if my learned friend is going into the history of German literature, I am very sorry for the Court, which has expressed its opinion that it will go on sitting *de die in diem*, because it certainly would be an interruption to other business of the Court. I protest, in the interests of the public, and strictly in the interests and for the sake of keeping the practice of the Court regular, against the introduction of what may be the danger of the German system.

Dr. Phillimore.—If my learned friend has ceased his interruption, I will continue my argument. My learned friend is

quite right in saying that we are discussing the admissibility of these articles, but he is quite wrong in supposing that I have forgotten it. The question is a very serious one. The question is whether I am not entitled to show that, under the garb of this essay, there is an attempt made to introduce opinions fatal to the system of Christianity taught in this country.

Dean of the Arches.—I am certainly exceedingly reluctant that we should enter into such a field of disquisition as that which you were about to commence, but when I remember that, for five whole days, the counsel against the admission of these articles went into the consideration of almost every possible topic that the ingenuity of man could bring to bear on the question, and some which I thought it was beyond the ingenuity of man to make applicable to the question—when I gave them that latitude because they were for the defence, I cannot deny to you the same opportunity of taking your own course, however painful the consequences may be to the Court, and to the public. I very deeply regret the manner in which this question, perhaps necessarily, has come under the consideration of the Court, because I cannot disguise from myself that questions of the deepest importance and of the greatest difficulty have been raised, which I did hope might have been disposed of, and that this case might have been disposed of without the Court being called upon to pronounce any opinion upon them whatsoever. I do trust still, that in the result the Court will be able to look at the admissibility of these articles, and to give a judicial decision without venturing upon ground that it really trembles to think this Court should be called upon to tread. I have made these observations—I will not stop you, for I think I am not justified in stopping you, when I consider the latitude which was taken on the other side.

Dr. Phillimore.—Yes, my lord, that was a latitude to which I, appearing for the prosecutor, offered no objection whatever, and, my lord, if I felt I was about to embark into the whole question of German literature, I should feel that I was committing an act, not only of folly, but almost of crime towards the Court. I am going to do no such thing, and if my learned friend, in his impatient haste, to prevent me laying before the Court the real opinions of his client, had not improperly interrupted me, he would have learned that what I intended to do was to show that Bunsen's opinion, who is here reviewed, must be taken in connection with a certain school in Germany, that these opinions might be laid before you concisely and shortly, without, by any means, entering into the

whole history of German philosophy, much less of German literature.

My lord, I hope that no observation which the Court addresses to me upon the mode of conducting the case, will fail of producing its effect, and I at once admit, that if, in the Court's opinion, the field upon which I was about to enter in, perhaps, a wrong notion of the discharge of my duty, would lead the Court astray from the real issue which is before it, and would embarrass it in deciding the legal point as to the admissibility of these articles, that I should, whatever my own opinion may be, bow to that suggestion of the Court, and not enter upon that part of the argument. My lord, it is perfectly true that your lordship sits here to decide, as far as it can be reduced within its limits, a legal question, but it is also most true, and I am sure your lordship would be the last person to deny it, that in a question of this description it is almost impossible to draw the line of demarcation between the law and the divinity, and that, with the best intention on the part of the counsel, it must occasionally happen that such a line is overstepped.

My lord, I made some remarks, at the opening of my address, upon the peculiar state of the English Church with regard to her jurisdiction, having no other court but the present in which she could proceed to obtain a declaration of what is her doctrine. Whether that be expedient or not expedient, whether it be the result of accident or intention, whether it ought to be amended by the legislature, or to be left in its present condition, with these grave considerations I have nothing at present to do. But the fact remains, and I must take the liberty, therefore, of observing, that it warrants, to some extent, the course which I have ventured to pursue in advocating the admission of these articles. If your lordship tells me, as I conceive you do now by implication, that the endeavour to show that what the author here reviewed was connected with a school of opinion wholly foreign to the British Church, would lead into a foreign issue (to use a legal expression), and really would not avail in the end to induce your lordship to admit these articles; I can only repeat that, assuming that to be the meaning of what your lordship has said, I should abstain from entering into that part of the question.

Dean of the Arches.—I wish you to understand, Dr. Phillimore, that I have not called upon you to abstain at all, but, on the contrary, I have overruled the objection which was taken by Dr. Deane to the course which you were pursuing. But for one moment let us consider the state in which this

case is. This is a prosecution commenced against Dr. Williams, and he is charged in these articles with having held doctrines which are contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to the Book of Common Prayer, also to certain passages which are cited from the Scriptures in those articles. Now, the ordinary duty of the Court would be, what it has had occasion to perform before, a difficult duty, but having not one atom, I might almost say, of the difficulty which applies to this case, to look at the passages which are produced, and which are charged to be heretical, to compare them with the meaning of the articles alleged to be impugned, and with such parts of the liturgy as are also adduced in proof of the impropriety of those passages, and reference also might be made to the Calendar. Now, that is the ordinary duty of the Court, and that is the ultimate duty it will have to discharge. But I cannot shut my eyes to this, that when I am called upon to perform the duty of examining these Thirty-nine Articles, I may be under the necessity of putting my construction and interpretation upon them. There is scarcely any end to the disquisition which may arise upon a subject of that description. It is not for me to stop you or to curtail your argument. It is for me to hear all you think it is fitting and proper for me to hear on behalf of your client—to take it into consideration ultimately, and then to form my own decision. And it would be infinitely better and safer for the cause of justice that this Court should be detained, though without necessity, than that anything should be shut out which by possibility could bear on the momentous questions which have been raised and discussed originally on the other side. Therefore follow your own course.

Dr. Phillimore.—Before I proceed with my argument, let me draw your lordship's attention to what appears at the bottom of the 66th page of this work of Dr. Williams. “ Yet the stress which he lays on the moral element atones for his sophistry as regards the predictive. On the whole, even in England, there is a wide gulf between the argument of our genuine critics, with the convictions of our most learned clergy, on the one side, and the assumptions of popular declamation on the other. This may be seen on a comparison of Kidder with Keith.” And what follows? “ But in Germany there has been a pathway streaming with light from Eichhorn to Ewald, aided by the poetical penetration of Herder, and the philological researches of Gesenius, throughout which the value of the moral element has been progressively raised, and that of the directly predictive, whether secular or Messianic,

has been lowered." My lord, the whole of that question was noticed by Dr. Williams. In this review he recommends, and the question is, whether it is competent for him so to do; he recommends a particular course of study, if I may say so; he recommends a particular class of authors to the attention of the English people. He is a beneficed clergyman, and if I show that he is recommending authors who have denied all the historical facts of the Gospel, would that not have some bearing perhaps on the construction of his language in those parts which are directly objected in the Articles? However, my lord, after what your lordship has said, and with a wish which I am sure is quite compatible with the discharge of my duty to my client, with my wish to do everything that can be suggested to ease the enormous burden, perhaps improperly, but so necessarily, thrown on the Court, I think that the observations which I have to make, may, instead of being particular, be quite general, and that after the citation of an authority upon the general bearing of that class of teaching, I may proceed with the rest of my argument. By that means, my lord, I shall not wholly leave unsaid what I was desirous of pointing out to the Court, and at the same time, the Court may take it rather as a part of my speech, perhaps, than as a direct authority which it is bound to examine into. Now, my lord, that will certainly save the Court, I think, from any embarrassment which might arise, and will not necessitate any reply as to the doctrines of the schools in Germany, beyond one of the same general character as that which I am about to make to you.

Now, my lord, the argument may be almost taken from the very words of Dr. Williams. He says that the school of thought which he recommends is one in which the predictive element of prophecy, whether secular or Messianic, has been lowered. And he says also, in note 1, to page 66. "Of prophecies, in the sense of prognostications, I utterly deny that there is any instance delivered by one of the illustrious Diadoche, whom the Jewish Church comprised in the name of prophets, and I shall regard Cyrus as an exception, when I believe the 137th Psalm to have been composed by David. Nay, I will go further, and assert that the contrary belief, the hypothesis of prognostication, is in irreconcilable oppugnancy to our Lord's declaration, that the times hath the Father reserved to himself." That is a note of Coleridge, I think, in his *Memoir of Cary*. And this is the mode in which the teaching in the review mainly is conveyed. It is conveyed by extracts of a character wholly at variance with the teaching of

the Church, from other persons, sometimes followed by no mark of approbation or disapprobation, and sometimes by a mark of positive approbation, but in no case I think throughout the review with any disapprobation of opinions, which are on the face of them at variance with the teaching of the English Church. I make these observations as falling within the scope of the question, what it is competent in a clergyman to write and promulgate under the guise of being merely a reviewer.

Now, my lord, perhaps I unnecessarily alarmed your lordship by my reference to the German school. At all events, I was only going to refer your lordship to one or two passages in a book of considerable authority of an English writer; but I will content myself with referring generally to Dr. Mills's admirable book on the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels (pages 29 to 31; and 87 to 90 set forth the doctrine of Strauss). I would add, too, the *Defence of the Faith*, by Mr. Robins. In these works will be found a review of the consequences which have come from those doctrines which are represented as making "a pathway streaming with light from Eichhorn to Ewald." I was only about to show that in fact all those writers who are here mentioned with praise and eulogy, and with whom the author reviewed is connected, which is the legal bearing of my remark. I was about to show your lordship, from their authority, that these writers had proceeded throughout with this kind of teaching, viz., abandoning the facts and materials of history, and retaining just as much of the moral part of it as they thought convenient, not building on the theory of revelation an explanation of what was admitted to be revealed, but, on the contrary, speculating first what it was probable would or would not be revealed, and then judging of revelation by its agreement or disagreement with his preconceived theories.

My lord, if I were to cite to you all the works which have been written on this subject, perhaps I should not carry this point any further. And after deliberating as well as I can, while proceeding with my speech, on what your lordship has said, I think I will abstain altogether from referring to any other work than that of the essayist, Dr. Williams himself, and I will make that statement of mine a part of my speech, to be contradicted by my learned friend in his reply, if he finds that he can conscientiously do so. Of course one cannot always make up one's mind immediately on a point of this sort, but reflecting on what your lordship has said, I think it will be the justest course towards the Court, and no injury

towards my client ; and this I would pray your lordship to observe, it throws light on these strange and unusual expressions of Dr. Williams, the effect of which it has been attempted to do away with by suggesting that they are only extravagant expressions of ordinary ideas. They are no such thing. They have a meaning ; a significant meaning of their own, and that significant meaning points in every instance to an abandonment of what he calls the traditional mode of teaching, and to the introduction of a new mode of teaching ; that new mode of teaching I charge to be a departure from the facts of revelation, with a substitution of pure speculation in their place. If that be so, it is contrary to the doctrines of the formularies of the Church of England. I do not know, my lord—I shall be thankful for any suggestion from the Court on this point—I do not know whether it would fall within your lordship's notion of a strict bearing on the admissibility of the articles, if I were to pursue a course which I had also intended to adopt, viz., that of pointing out that these notions here paraded before your lordship, in this writing, are derived from what I must consider an unhallowed and suspicious source, viz., either are allied to, or are identical with, the published opinions of acknowledged English deists during the last century ; or whether your lordship would include such a reference as this within the spirit of your prohibition.

Dean of the Arches.—I say nothing of the kind.

Dr. Phillimore.—Then I will say a word upon that subject, my lord, and make that a head and branch of my argument, and if your lordship should feel a doubt as to the tendency and scope of this essay, it would surely be a legal ground in this Ecclesiastical Court for viewing with suspicion, and I might go further, for visiting with admonition opinions which were, however, identical with those promulgated by writers avowedly not Christian, with those of the deists.

My lord, in the “*Reflections on the Revolution of France*,” written by Mr. Burke, you will find observations at page 171 of volume v. of his works. “I hear on all hands that a cabal, calling itself philosophic, receives the glory of many of the late proceedings, and that their opinions and systems are the true actuating spirit of the whole of them ; I have heard of no party in England, literary or political, at any time known by such a description. It is not with you composed of those men, is it ? whom the vulgar, in their blunt, homely style, commonly called Atheists and Infidels ! If it be, I admit that we too have had writers of that description, who made some noise in their day. At present they repose in lasting obli-

vion." That was a mistake. The predictive element was not in Mr. Burke, when he said that "those born within the last forty years had read one word of Collins, and Toland, and Tindall, and Chubb and Morgan, and that whole race, who called themselves Freethinkers. Who now reads Bolingbroke? who ever read him through? ask the booksellers of London, what is become of these lights in the world? In a few years their few successors will go to the family vault of all the Capulets. But whatever they were, or are, with us, they were and are wholly unconnected individuals. With us they kept the common nature of their kind, and were not gregarious."

Now, in these writings of Collins, Toland, Tyndal, Chubb, and Morgan, I have found a great many of the positions which are contended for in this Review, and especially I find that the points which the Deists were most anxious to establish, were, that the prophecies of Isaiah and Daniel did not apply to our Lord, and that such acts as the offering up of Isaac by Abraham could not have been a matter of Divine command. It may seem a little singular that those should be the points upon which we have found it our duty in a great measure to lay articles against Dr Williams. It is not singular to those who are acquainted with the literature of the German School, because you will find in the earlier history of that literature many of those discarded works of infidels of Great Britain were translated, and found favour in the eyes of Continental, but especially German, writers; therefore, it is not so strange as it may appear, but it is historically curious to see how heresies, so to speak, come round again—Germans adopting the discarded doctrines of the English Deists, and a simple Englishman, or Welchman, imagining himself full of research and wisdom while adopting the German views as new discoveries, which discoveries had been derived originally from the English Deists, these English Deists doing little more than repeat the exploded heresies of Porphyry in the third century. A book which is well known upon this point, in which a great many of those writers are collected together, is *Leland's Deistical Writers*; and in the first and second volumes the Court will see a good many passages in support of what I have stated. I have found the same difficulty that Burke anticipated in getting the original books themselves at the hands of booksellers (for I am happy to say they have gone as I venture humbly to hope these *Essays and Reviews* may go, to the limbo of forgotten things) but I have found one or two copies with great difficulty, and where I have been able to verify Leland, he is correct in his statements. There is also a good

sketch I think of the whole matter to be found in a book recently published, called a *A Defence of Faith*, by Mr. Robins. Chapter iv. is a chapter on English Deism, in which the Court will find, perhaps, a very convenient summary of the doctrines by those persons maintained. He takes up the history as early as Lord Herbert of Cherbury, who, singularly enough, was the brother of the pious George Herbert. He then goes into what it will not be necessary to do more than advert to; he touches upon Hobbes's Works, and he comes down to those authors to whom I have referred. One was a person of the name of Blount: he was born in 1654, and died in 1693; another was Toland—he was born in 1670, and died in 1792; and another was Collins, who was one of the principal, and who was born in 1676, and died in 1729: he wrote a *Discourse on Free-Thinking*, and he wrote also a *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Revelation*, not a wholly immaterial fact with reference to this book. Your lordship will remember how Bishop Chandler is spoken of in Dr. Williams's Essay, and how very incorrectly this bishop is stated to have thought that there were only twelve Old Testament Messianic Predictions, whereas, he says he has only selected twelve out of a vast number. Bishop Chandler's book was written in answer to this Collins. His proposition was, that Christianity was founded upon Judaism, or the New Testament upon the Old Testament, and if the proof the New Testament from the Old Testament were invalid, then Christianity would be false. We have in this Essay a denial more especially of the prophecies of Daniel, and the prophecies of Isaiah. I will refer you to those passages in Leland in which they are mentioned, and to one or two more. The whole history of Collins is given in *Leland against Deistical Writers*, vol. i., page 108, in his sixth letter; and he gives, among other statements, this:—“Such was this gentleman's zeal against Christianity, that some years after he thought fit to attack it in another way, which was more subtil and more dangerous. He published a *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, London, 1724, 8vo., as if his design had been to do real service to Christianity by establishing it upon a sure and solid foundation. The scheme he lays down is this: that our Saviour and his Apostles put the whole proof of Christianity solely and entirely upon the prophecies of the Old Testament. That if these proofs are valid, Christianity is established upon its true foundation; but if they are invalid, and the arguments brought from thence be not conclusive, and the prophecies cited from thence not fulfilled, Christianity has no just founda-

tion, and is therefore false. Accordingly, he sets himself to show that the prophecies cited in the New Testament from the Old in proof of Christianity, four or five of which he particularly considers are only typical and allegorical proofs; and that allegorical proofs are no proofs, according to scholastic rules, *i. e.*, as he plainly intends it according to the rules of sound reason and common sense. He asserts that the expectation of the Messiah did not obtain among the Jews till a little before the time of our Saviour's appearing, when they were under the oppression of the Romans, and that the Apostles put a new interpretation upon the Jewish books, which was not agreeable to the obvious and literal meaning of those books, and was contrary to the sense of the Jewish nation. That Christianity deriveth all its authority from the Old Testament, and is wholly revealed there—not literally, but mystically and allegorically—and that, therefore, Christianity is the allegorical sense of the Old Testament, and is not improperly called Mystical Judaism: and that, consequently, the Old Testament is, properly speaking, the sole true canon of Christians. That the allegorical reasoning is set up by St. Paul and the other Apostles, as the true and only reasoning proper to bring all men to the faith of Christ, and all other methods of reasoning are wholly discarded. Thus it appeareth that the evident design of this author's book is to show that the only foundation on which Christianity is built is false. That the first publishers of the Gospel laid the whole support and credit of Christ's Divine mission, and of the religion he taught, upon pretended Jewish prophecies, applied in a sense which had no foundation in the prophecies themselves, and contrary to the plain original meaning and intention of those prophecies themselves. And at page 111, the writer goes on to say, "With regard to the prophecies, the course of his reasoning really amounts to this: that because there are difficulties and obscurities attending some very few passages cited out of the Old Testament in the New, as having a reference to the times of the Gospel—and we cannot well, at this distance, see the propriety of the application—therefore, the whole of the New Testament is false, and the accounts given of our Saviour, his excellent discourses, the miracles he performed, and the illustrious attestations given to him from heaven are of no force at all, and all the arguments drawn from thence are ineffectual and vain. It is in the same strain of reasoning that he concludes that, because four or five prophecies, for he produces no more, cited in the New Testament from the Old, seem not to

relate to the Gospel times in a literal, but in a secondary and typical—*i.e.*, as he explains it, an allegorical sense—therefore, none of the Old Testament prophecies can be applied directly and literally at all, or have any relation to our Saviour and the Gospel dispensation.” Therefore, the very main argument which those avowed freethinkers adopted, namely, that there were no prophecies in the Old Testament which could be made to apply to the New, is the very argument which pervades the whole of Dr. Williams’s reasoning upon that subject. He goes on, at page 120: “The author of the *Grounds*,” &c. (which was another work of Collins) thought fit, in 1727, to publish a second book, which was to pass for a defence of his first, in answer to his several adversaries, and particularly to the Bishop of Litchfield. It was entitled *The scheme of Literal Prophecy considered*. In this book he very slightly passeth over the chief things he ought to have proved, and on which in his former book he had laid the greatest stress. Instead of confirming what he had so positively asserted before, that the Prophecies of the Old Testament were the only proof on which Christianity is founded, he only shows that they are part of the proof insisted on by our Saviour and his Apostles, and most disingenuously supposes that his adversaries would not allow them to be any proofs at all.” Then, my lord, in page 121, he goes on to say, “He has nothing now to prove that the Old Testament is the only canon of Christians, or that the allegorical sense is the only sense of prophecies intended by our Saviour and his Apostles.” Then, at page 122: “But there is no part of the literal scheme, &c., which the author has so much laboured, as that where he hath collected together all that he could meet with against the antiquity and authority of the Book of Daniel and the prophecies contained there.” This occasioned a second answer from the learned bishop, intitled, *A Vindication of the Defence of Christianity, from the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, published in 1728; in which he hath largely and very solidly vindicated the antiquity and authority of the Book of Daniel, and the application of the prophecies there contained. “That was the part upon which he had most laboured. He had collected together all he could meet with against the antiquity and authority of the Book of Daniel, and the prophecies contained therein.” The next writer whom I would introduce to the Court’s attention is a gentleman of the name of Woolston, and he was a writer who followed closely upon the heels of Collins, and he argued also that Christianity was founded upon the Old Testament prophecies, taken not in a literal but

an allegorical sense, in a false sense contrary to the original intention of the prophets themselves. And Leland says, at page 127: "In opposition to him it was clearly shown that many of the Old Testament Prophecies are justly applied to our Saviour in their proper and literal sense. Besides which, it was urged that there were other solid proofs of Christianity, particularly that our Saviour's miracles and His resurrection from the dead were illustrious attestations given to Him from heaven, and evident proofs of His Divine mission. And now, under pretence of acting the part of a moderator in this controversy, a new antagonist arose, Mr. Woolston, who endeavoured to allegorize away the miracles of our Saviour, as Mr. Collins had done the prophecies." And, at page 128, he observes of this man: "There are two ways by which he endeavours to answer the design he hath in view. The one is by showing that the literal sense of our Saviour's miracles is denied by the most ancient and venerable writers of the Christian Church; the other is by showing the absurdity of the accounts given in the Gospels taken in the literal sense. With regard to the first of these he hath, with great pomp, produced many testimonies of the Fathers, for whom he professeth the profoundest veneration; and, by a strange disingenuity, endeavoureth to represent them as absolutely denying the facts themselves related in the Gospel." He chiefly confined himself to a denial of the miracles, and he was answered by Zachary Pearce, Bishop of Bangor, and by Dr. Smallbrook, the Bishop of St. David's, in whose work, called *A Vindication of our Saviour's Miracles*, Woolston's discourses on them are particularly examined. Then, my lord, there was a Dr. Tindal, who published several works. I have not the works themselves, but only an abridgment of them here; but he wrote *An account of Christianity as old as the Creation*, and he particularly set himself to expose the revelation contained in the Old and New Testament. He pursued the plan of decrying the prophecies and of attacking the miracles, showing that the prophecies must be literally interpreted, and attacking the miracles. And then there was Morgan, of whom Leland says this, at page 180: "By a prevarication and a disingenuity which is not easily paralleled, except among some of those that have appeared on the same side under all these fair pretences and disguises, he hath covered as determined a malice against the honour and authority of the Christian revelation as any of those that have written before him. It is not easy to form a distinct notion of what he understandeth by that revelation, the useful-

ness of which he would bethought to acknowledge. He granteth that God may, if He thinks fit, communicate His Will by immediate inspiration, or supernatural illumination, yea, and that what he thus communicates may come with evidence equal to a mathematical demonstration. Yet he plainly intimates that it can never be proved that God hath ever thus communicated his will, and treats such inspiration as the invention of our spiritual scholastics or systematical divines. By several passages of his book, especially if compared with what he saith in his second volume, which he published in defence of it, it appeareth that by revelation he understandeth any discovery of truth, in what way soever a man comes by it, even though it be by the strength and superiority of his own natural faculties. So that, all that have discovered rational or moral truth, by their own study and application in the use of their natural faculties, may be said according to this account of it to have had the light of revelation." He was the precursor of that great discovery that inspiration was that influence which a man's natural faculties receive, and he was the precursor of that great discovery which places the prophets on the same footing as Luther. At page 182, Leland says, "The great principle he hath laid down, and which runs through the whole book, is that there is but one certain and infallible mark or criterion of Divine truth" (this is the great discovery of the verifying faculty), "or of any doctrine or law as coming from God, and that is the moral truth, reason, or fitness of the thing itself, when it comes to be fairly proposed to and considered by the mind or understanding. He frequently declareth that we are not to receive anything as true in religion upon any authority whatsoever, or upon any other foundation than its own intrinsic evidence or moral fitness. And this he explaineth to be its conduceableness to our happiness, as appearing to our reason, independently of all authority. So that after all, his fair pretences about the benefit of revelations, we are not to receive anything upon the authority of revelation at all—supposing any persons to have been extraordinarily sent of God to make a discovery of His Will concerning truth or duty, whatever credentials they produce to prove their Divine mission, we are not to receive anything upon that authority, no more than if they were not thus extraordinarily sent of God. The doctrines and laws they deliver as from God, in what way soever they are attested and confirmed, are really and entirely on the same footing with the opinion of philosophers or moralists, who do not pretend to be extraordinarily sent of God at all, *i.e.*,

we are to believe the doctrines they teach, if upon examining them we find them to be true, by reasons drawn from the nature of things ; and we are to submit to their precepts and directions, if upon considering them, we are satisfied that they tend to our own advantage and happiness ; but their authority, abstractly from the reason of the thing, must have no weight to determine us. Thus the proper use and advantage of revelation, which is to assure us by a Divine testimony of the truth of things, which either we could not have known at all, or not so certainly and clearly, by our own unassisted reason, and with regard to our practice to direct us to our duty, and bind it upon us by express precepts, confirmed by a Divine authority, is entirely set aside by this author. Accordingly, he will not allow either miracles or prophecy to be any proof of Divine revelation, or any reason at all for our believing any doctrines, or submitting to any laws which have this attestation given to them. This being the true state of the case according to him, that nothing is to be received upon the authority of revelation, it is to no great purpose to inquire how this revelation is communicated to us. Then he says, at page 185, “ He, as well as that author,” that is Tindal, “ is for discarding all authority, even a divine one in matters of religion, and represents the receiving anything purely upon such authority as a renouncing our reason. According to him, the only way any man, even of the meanest capacity, can have to be fully assured of the truth of any doctrine in religion, is by the reason of the thing, or its own intrinsic evidence, independent of all authority or testimony.” At page 186, he says, “ As to the revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures, he expressly and avowedly rejecteth the Old Testament, and openly declareth that he will have nothing to do with it in his religion. He representeth the Law of Moses as having neither truth nor goodness in it, and as a wretched scheme of superstition, blindness, and slavery contrary to all reason and common sense, set up under the specious popular pretence of a Divine instruction and revelation from God. “ And he endeavours to prove that this was the sentiment of St. Paul. Among other heavy charges which he hath advanced against that law, one is, that it encouraged human sacrifices, as the highest act of religion and devotion, when offered not to idols, but to God ; and he takes occasion to consider the case of Abraham’s being commanded to offer up Isaac, which he represents as absolutely unhinging and dissolving the whole law of nature. He then goes on to consider the spirit of prophecy. “ As to the New Testament, though

he frequently affecteth to speak with great veneration of Jesus Christ, yet he insinuateth very base and unworthy reflections upon his person and character. That he pretended to be the Messiah foretold by the prophets, though he very well knew that those prophets had only spoken of a temporal Jewish prince, who was to arise and reign in Judea, and that accordingly He suffered Himself to be carried about by the mob as their Messiah, for a twelvemonth together; and did not renounce that character till His death, when He absolutely disclaimed His being the Messiah foretold in the prophetic writings, and died upon that renunciation. As to the apostles, the first authorized teachers and publishers of the religion of Jesus, he affirms that they themselves never so much as pretended to be under the unerring guidance and “inspiration of the Holy Ghost.” Every one of those points will be found in the essay before us, the rejecting of the prophecies of the Old Testament, the attack upon the offering by Abraham of Isaac, the putting forward of the verifying faculty to judge of revelation, and the attack upon the Book of Daniel. And he says, at page 191, “He frequently inveighs against all historical faith, and books of historical religion, as he calls the Holy Scriptures, as of no use or importance at all, as if the belief of the important facts recorded in the Gospel, relating to our Lord Jesus Christ, had nothing to do with the faith of a Christian.”

There was another writer who came later into the field, Chubb, and Chubb held a good many of those opinions, and, at page 385, after speaking of Chubb, he says, “Nor only do these gentlemen join in representing themselves as persons of extraordinary penetration, and of the most upright intentions, but they sometimes seem to claim a kind of infallibility. They talk of having their understandings irradiated with the beams of immutable eternal reason, so that they are sure not to run into any errors of moment, and that they have an infallible mark and criterion of Divine truth, in which men cannot be mistaken. They propose to direct men to the eternal and invariable rule of right and wrong, as to an infallible guide, and as the solid ground of peace and safety. They assure us that deism on the religion they would recommend, is bright as the heavenly light, and free from all ambiguities; that it makes all men happy that embrace it; that it perfectly satisfies all doubts, and procures the troubled soul unshaken rest. And as they take care to recommend themselves and their own writings to the esteem and admiration of mankind, so they give a very disadvantageous idea of those that stand up

as advocates for revealed religion. They speak in a sneering, contemptuous way of such books as Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacre*, Dr. Clark's *Discourse*, and so on. They often speak magnificently of keeping close to the eternal reason and nature of things, and profess a high esteem for what they call the uncorrupted religion of reason and nature, which is always invariably the same." Leland, in his second volume, analysed the whole of Lord Bolingbroke's Works, and particularly those parts in which he said, "That it is profane and blasphemous to ascribe the Jewish Scriptures to revelation or inspiration from God, that the history contained there is false and incredible, and the scheme of religion taught in these writings is absolutely unworthy to God, and repugnant to his Divine perfection." P. 157. He altogether, in fact, rejected all the historical arguments by which the Old Testament would be supported, and contended that Moses was as ignorant of the true system of the universe as any of the people of his age. These arguments will be found in great detail, set forth in Leland—I have made these references for the purpose of showing the identity of the main points insisted upon by these writers with those that form the subject of the present review.

There are various other places in *Leland's Summary*, and in the volume dedicated to the analysis of Lord Bolingbroke's infidelity, which might also be cited.

As the arguments in the Essays were forestalled by the Deists of the last century, it was not surprising, as I ventured in opening to show, that this Review should be hailed with great satisfaction by Deists of the present day, a fact which is not, and indeed cannot be, denied. It is said it is very hard that authors should be driven to conclusions which they do not adopt. I cannot help thinking, however, that the coincidence is very remarkable between the premises of Dr. Williams, and of these Deistical and Infidel writers. There is one more passage by which I might strengthen that position. You will find at page 194, of Mr. Robins's work, this remark, "He thought it worth while to reproduce the argument of Collins against the authority of the Book of Daniel. These are the words of Collins, "That Daniel who was a person carried captive in the Babylonish captivity, cannot be supposed to be the author of this Book which abounds with derivations from the Greek, which was a language unknown to the Jews in, and for a long time after the captivity, and not understood by them till the Grecian Empire prevailed, and they became Hellenized." That is quoted from Collins's *Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered*, chapter v., section 6,

page 142 ; the writer says, “ He goes on to give all the other arguments which Dr. Williams cites from Baron Bunsen, the place in the canon, the late style of the Chaldee, the great clearness of the statement, and the exact mention of the dates.”

My lord, I have stated most of my authorities to your lordship, upon this question of inspiration, and of the prophecies ; and it becomes my duty to deal a little with some of the authorities that have been cited on the other side upon the same point. Now, with great respect for the erudition of my learned friends, on an examination of the various authorities which they have cited, I do not find many which I should be inclined to consider as even in appearance hostile to the position which I am contending for as the position of the Church of England. One there certainly was which would require very careful attention, and which I was very much surprised to hear cited, and I did not discover till after some examination of the authority referred to, how it could be made to appear to be in favour of Dr. Williams. That was the great authority of Bishop Pearson. Your lordship will remember that in the extract from Dr. Williams’s Work, the expression is this, after saying in substance in the 69th page, that remorseless criticism has disposed of all the predictive passages of the prophets, he says, “ There is one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messianic.” And in another part of the Essay he uses the same expression, “ Messianic,” Now, it is important that your lordship should clearly see upon the common principles of construction, in what sense the writer is using the word, “ Messianic,” and I think it cannot be seriously contended that he is using it in any other sense than as predictive of our Saviour. It is important that that should be borne in mind, and that would appear from the epithet to which it is put in contradistinction at the bottom of page 66. “ But in Germany there has been a pathway streaming with light from Eichhorn to Ewald, aided by the poetical penetration of Herder, and the philological researches of Gesenius throughout which the value of the moral element in prophecy has been progressively raised, and that of the directly predictive whether secular or Messianic.” “ Messianic ” is here opposed to “ secular.” I draw your lordship’s attention to that part, in consequence of an argument which I am going to found upon it. I think it disposes altogether of the apparent authority of Bishop Pearson, and that is the reason why I am anxious that your lordship should understand my position. My position is this, that when the writer, Dr. Williams, uses

the word “ Messianic ” from the contest, he must mean predictive of our Lord, and nothing else, that he cannot use it in any confined and technical sense, but that he means predictive of our Lord, and I say, that is proved by the opposition in which it stands to the word “ secular,” “ whether secular or Messianic.” Now, my learned friend, Dr. Dean, very ingeniously suggested that in that he had done very little more than Bishop Pearson had done, for he said, to my astonishment, that Bishop Pearson held that there was only one Messianic prophecy. Of course, my learned friend, must have meant (because every page of the work would contradict any other supposition) that Bishop Pearson said, there was only one prophecy in which the word “ Messiah,” was used, I say that because in the whole of the Greek work on the exposition of the Creed there are passages without end in which our Saviour is said to have been foretold in the Old Testament. The work proceeds upon that scheme of showing what was foretold, and showing that the prophecies applied to our Saviour. It would be reading the work at large to prove that proposition, and I will therefore leave it upon my assertion of the fact. How comes it that Bishop Pearson really said that there was only one Messianic prophecy, if he has said so, and in what sense has he said it? In the second article which is the article, “ And in Jesus Christ,” the expression occurs, to which my learned friend referred. I do not know whether my learned friend quoted from the folio edition, but there is a folio edition, and an octavo edition. I have found the expression in the folio edition, and I therefore quote from that; it is very near the beginning of the second article. The expression used in Pearson is this, “ Many are the prophecies which concern Him (that is Jesus Christ), many of the promises which are made of Him, but yet some of them very obscure; others though plainer yet have relation only to the person, not to the notion or the word ‘ Messias.’ Wherever He is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person, except in one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold to be cut off; and yet even there the Greek translation hath not the ‘ Messiah,’ but the ‘ Unction.’ It may, therefore, seem something strange how so universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the Messias, should be spread through the Church of the Jews.” Now, if my learned friend, meant anything by his argument in support of Dr. Williams’s views, he meant to say this, that Dr. Williams had said, there were only one or two prophecies of the Messiah, and that Bishop

Pearson had said, there was really only one. Therefore, your lordship will see the importance of keeping in mind the sense in which Dr. Williams is using the term "Messianic prediction," and the sense in which, in this particular instance, the author is using the word "Messiah." He is there speaking of the word "Messiah," as "Anointed," Dr. Williams is speaking of the predictions of our Saviour altogether, and but for my respect for my learned friend, I should say it was a mere quibble to put the two upon the same footing, it would be asking your lordship to believe a proposition at which any body really even cursorily acquainted with Pearson's works would smile; that Bishop Pearson said, that in the Old Testament there were no predictions of our Lord, but one. What Bishop Pearson says is this, "a particular use of the word 'Messias' or 'Anointed' only occurs in one." If you read the beginning of the chapter, it runs in this way: "Having thus explained the proper name of our Saviour Jesus, we come unto that title of his office usually joined with his name, which is, therefore, the more diligently to be examined, because the Jews, who always acknowledged him to be Jesus, ever denied him to be Christ, and agreed together that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue. For the full explication of this title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the word; secondly, to show upon what ground the Jews always expected a Christ, or Messias; thirdly, to prove that the Messias promised to the Jews is already come; fourthly, to demonstrate that our Jesus is that Messias; and, fifthly, to declare in what that unction by which Jesus is Christ doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that Jesus is Christ. For the first we find in the Scriptures two several names, Messias and Christ, but both of the same signification; as appeareth by the speech of the Woman of Samaria, 'I know that Messias cometh which is called Christ;' and more plainly by what Andrew spake unto his brother Simon. We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ; 'Messias' in the Hebrew tongue, 'Christ' in the Greek, 'Messias' the language of Andrew and the Woman of Samaria, who spake in Syriae; 'Christ,' the interpretation of St. John, who wrote his Gospel in the Greek, as the most general language of those days, and the signification of them both is 'the Anointed.' St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, writing in that language, used the Greek name, which

the Latins did retain, calling him constantly Christus, and we, in English, have retained the same, as universally naming him Christ. Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is to be understood, not simply according to the action only, but as it involveth the design in the custom of anointing. For, in the law, whatsoever was anointed was set apart, as ordained to some special use or office." Then he goes on:—"Hence the priest that is anointed signifieth, in the phrase of Moses, the High Priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his unction." Then comes the passage, "When, therefore, Jesus is called the Messias or Christ, and that long after the anointing oil had ceased, it signified no less than a person set apart by God anointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the highest office, of which all those employments under the law, in the obtaining of which oil was used, were but types and shadows; and this may suffice for the signification of the word. That there was among the Jews an expectation of such a Christ to come is most evident; the Woman of Samaria could speak with confidence, 'I know that Messias cometh.' And the unbelieving Jews who will not acknowledge that he is already come, expect him still. Thus we find," and then he quotes a variety of texts, and then he says, "Wheresoever he is spoken of as the anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold to be cut off; and yet even there the Greek translation hath not the 'Messiah,' but the 'unction.'" Therefore, according to what Bishop Pearson says, "two propositions are contained in that passage, the one is that where he is spoken of as the 'Anointed,' in the first instance some other person may be understood." Now, I pray your lordship to observe, that we have never contended, and do not contend, that there may not be a double sense to prophecy, but we say that Dr. Williams rejects altogether any predictive sense at all. All that Bishop Pearson says, is, "It may well be first understood of some other person, except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold to be cut off;" but he is speaking strictly of the Hebrew word "Messiah," which he has there explained; he is not speaking of the predictions of our Lord generally. I ask your lordship to construe this Review upon the ordinary principle of construction, and see whether you can possibly arrive at that conclusion, namely, that what Dr. Williams meant to say was, "there are plenty of prophecies of our Lord and Saviour in the Old Testament, but only one in which he is mentioned as the Messiah;" because if that be not the meaning of Dr. Williams.

then Bishop Pearson ceases to have even the appearance of an argument in his favour, so I dispose of that remarkable argument of my learned friend; I say remarkable, because, with the exception of Bishop Lowth and Bishop Marsh, there really were no authorities cited which had the appearance of being in favour of Dr. Williams's position. I hope I have made myself distinctly understood upon that point to the Court. I say, the word “Messianic,” in Dr. Williams's sense, means “predictive of our Lord,” as he has used it.

Now, Bishop Lowth has been very much cited as an authority upon almost every part of the case. He is, it is said, an authority for showing that you may criticise the Old Testament, so as to put a totally different sense upon it from that which you have been accustomed to use, and that you may show that the original version is at variance with the real version, and that, in fact, you can establish by his authority that the interpretation and the text of the Bible are open questions with the Church of England to that extent, and that by the use of him as an example, you may place the case under the protection of the doctrines laid down in the Gorham case, and in “*Burder v. Heath*.” It becomes, therefore, of considerable importance that Bishop Lowth's work should be examined. Bishop Lowth was a most distinguished person, and his authority must be of great weight as a corroborative authority in any decision upon a matter of this description. He was Bishop of London, and had been Bishop of Oxford, and was a great Hebrew scholar; and among his works he published a new translation of Isaiah with a preliminary dissertation, and notes critical, philosophical, and explanatory. Before I enter upon an examination of him, to see whether he will bear this load which is laid upon his shoulders, I wish to make a general remark which applies to all this class of authorities. It is one thing to criticise the Bible, and by your criticism to elicit stronger evidence for the truth of the historical facts and of the spiritual doctrines which it contains, and it is a wholly different thing to criticise the Bible, and deduce from that criticism a denial of the historical facts, and of the doctrines which follow from those facts. In the former case there can be no doubt whatever of the liberty of the clergy of the Church of England, but, in the latter case, if (and I am obliged to put a position hypothetically which I utterly disbelieve) any sound criticism should arrive at this conclusion, namely, I am obliged to say that the whole of these facts (not a particular particle, which it is idle to talk about, or a particular word which is insignificant in itself, or a parti-

cular punctuation) are historically and really untrue; if the result of my criticism leads me to the conclusion, for instance, that the whole story of Abraham is falsely stated, I mean "falsely" in the sense of an incorrect translation; if the result of my criticism is that as to other portions of Holy Scripture, upon the authority of which doctrines have been drawn, and propositions have been settled and embodied in the formularies of the Church; if the facts related in those passages are falsely related, and therefore the doctrines drawn from them must be falsely stated, I certainly am not prepared to say that the clergyman who holds this opinion can continue honestly to subscribe to Articles which are built upon the foundation of those passages all through. At all events there is a wide distinction of principle between the two kinds of criticism, and between the results at which they arrive. The one may be quite within the fair scope of a clergyman's liberty under the Thirty-nine Articles, and the other is without it; and I must say again, at the risk of wearying your lordship, that subscription to the Articles cannot, according to the law, be practically and substantially evaded in any form, whether that form be, as is alleged, a criticism and impartial examination, or whether it be in any other shape. If the necessary result be that the doctrines in the Articles cannot be true, then you cannot honestly remain a subscriber to those Articles.

Now, apply that principle to Dr. Lowth's translation of Isaiah, and what is the very first thing you meet with? Why, that the effect of the whole translation is to strengthen greatly the predictive element of that evangelical prophet. The very famous translation of the 53rd of Isaiah, which is here given, is always cited by all commentators upon the Old Testament as having greatly strengthened the prediction of our Lord contained in that chapter, and so Dr. Lowth thought himself, and it is because it is so contained in that chapter that it is appointed by the Church to be read on Good Friday. The great alteration in Dr. Lowth's translation was this: "By an oppressive judgment he was taken off. And his manner of life who would declare, for he was cut off from the land of the living, for the transgression of my people he was smitten to death;" and then follows this: "And his grave was appointed with the wicked, but with the rich man was his tomb," which brings the prophecy into exact accordance with the fact which the translation in our Bible might appear to have confused. The Court knows that the 53rd chapter of Isaiah in our Bible is this: "And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence,

neither was any deceit in his mouth." And Bishop Lowth's scholarship led him to this: "And his grave was appointed with the wicked, but with the rich man was his tomb," which, as your lordship knows, brings it exactly in accordance with the actual facts recorded in the Evangelists. That style of criticism is a totally different one from what is called, to use Dr. Williams's own expression, the "destructive style of criticism," which destroys all the prophecies of the Old Testament, and which is surely a very different one from that which establishes them. Now, what does Dr. Lowth say upon the limits of interpretation, and upon the subject of inspiration? He says, on the 42nd page of his preliminary dissertation, "If it be asked what then is the real condition of the present Hebrew text, and of what sort, and in what number are the mistakes which we must acknowledge to be found in it? it is answered that the condition of the Hebrew text is such as from the nature of the thing, the antiquity of the writings themselves, the want of due care or critical skill (in which latter, at least, the Jews have been exceedingly deficient) might in all reason have been expected; that the mistakes are frequent, and of various kinds; of letters, words, and sentences, by variation, omission, transposition, such as often injure the beauty and elegance, embarrass the construction, alter or obscure the sense, and sometimes render it quite unintelligible. If it be objected that a concession so large as this is tends to invalidate the authority of Scripture, that it gives up in effect the certainty and authenticity of the doctrines contained in it, and exposes our religion naked and defenceless to the assaults of its enemies; this, I think, is a vain and groundless apprehension. Casual errors may blemish parts, but do not destroy or much alter the whole. If the Iliad or the Æneid had come down to us with more errors in all the copies than are to be found in the worst manuscript now extant of either, without doubt many particular passages would have lost much of their beauty; in many the sense would have been greatly injured, in some rendered wholly unintelligible; but the plan of the poem in the whole and in its parts, the fable, the mythology, the machinery, the characters, the great constituent parts would still have been visible and apparent without having suffered any essential diminution of their greatness. Of all the precious remains of antiquity, perhaps Aristotle's *Treatise on Poetry* is come down to us as much injured by time as any. As it has been greatly mutilated in the whole, some considerable members of it being lost; so the parts remaining have suffered in proportion, and many pas-

sages are rendered very obscure, probably by the imperfection and frequent mistakes of the copies now extant. Yet, notwithstanding these disadvantages, this treatise, so much injured by time, and so mutilated, still continues to be the great code of criticism, the fundamental principles of which are plainly deducible from it; we still have recourse to it for the rules and laws of epic and dramatic poetry, and the imperfection of the copy does not at all impeach the authority of the legislator. Important and fundamental doctrines do not wholly depend on single passages; an universal harmony runs through the Holy Scriptures; the parts mutually support each other, and supply one another's deficiencies and obscurities. Superficial damages and partial defects may greatly diminish the beauty of the edifice, without injuring its strength, and bringing on utter ruin and destruction." Then he says, "The copies of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament being then subject, like all other ancient writings, to mistakes arising from the unskilfulness or inattention of transcribers, a plain matter-of-fact, which cannot be denied, and needs not be palliated; it is to be considered what remedy can be applied of this case; how such mistakes can be corrected upon certain or highly probable grounds." Then he enters upon the translation which he has given of this chapter of Isaiah, and then he says, at page 53, "The sublime and spiritual uses to be made of this peculiarly evangelical prophet" (I pray especial attention to these words), "must, as I have observed, be all founded on a faithful representation of the literal sense which his words contain." He says, "To proceed further," and so on, would hardly be consistent with his present engagements, and then the translation follows after the preliminary dissertation, and he gives the whole of the prophecy, his great object being, as he specifies in more than one place in his preface, to show that the translation which he thinks better than the original in this case is a translation which more strongly confirms the predictions of our Lord, and makes Isaiah still more effectually an Evangelical prophet than he would be in the ordinary version. The work is dedicated to George the Third. Upon this translation, having this object in view, my learned friend builds the argument that the interpretation and text of the Bible are open questions with the Church of England. I believe this passage, at page xxxvii., my learned friend quoted: "The method of studying the Scriptures of the Old Testament has been very defective hitherto in both these respects. Besides the difficulties attending it arising from the nature of the thing itself, the language in which it is written," and so forth. My

learned friend read that passage, which I need not read, about the Masoretic punctuation, and at the end of that passage he says, “ Accordingly our public translations in the modern tongues for the use of the Church among Protestants, and so likewise, the modern Latin translations are, for the most part, close copies of the Hebrew printed text, and are in reality only versions at secondhand, translations of the Jews’ interpretation of the Old Testament. We do not deny the usefulness of this interpretation, nor would we be thought to detract from its merit by setting it in this light ; it is, upon the whole, preferable to any one of the ancient versions—it has probably the great advantage of having been formed upon a traditional explanation of the text, and of being generally agreeable to that sense of Scripture which passed current, and was commonly received by the Jewish nation in ancient times, and it has certainly been of great service to the moderns in leading them into the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue.” Then he goes into that argument which I a little anticipated. That is the passage, I believe, which my learned friend read. But the intention of Bishop Lowth is perfectly clear. The intention of Bishop Lowth was to strengthen, and not to weaken the Scriptures, to fortify, and not to invalidate the predictive element they contained of our Saviour. And I do not hesitate to say that if Bishop Lowth, or anybody else, had published a work with a translation of the Bible which he had recommended to be used, and which was at variance with the doctrines contained in the Articles of the Church of England, he would have been liable to ecclesiastical punishment for putting forth such a work, if he retained his benefice in the Church. It comes to the same thing—it is the same thing over again—it does not signify by what process you do it. If you destroy the Scripture upon which the doctrine is built, you destroy the doctrine, and if you destroy the doctrine you cannot continue honestly to subscribe to the article which sets up that doctrine. However, I submit to your lordship, that there is the widest possible difference in the principle upon which the two proceed.

There was another authority also, which was insisted upon very much in the same way, and the only other remarkable one I think—Bishop Marsh’s lectures. I have them here. He wrote two works which are sometimes confused together ; one a commentary on *Michaelis*, and the other, *A Course of Lectures, containing a description and systematic arrangement of the several branches of Divinity, accompanied with an account both of the principal authors, and of the progress which*

has been made at different periods. Now, if I wanted to find a strong authority for the doctrine for which I am contending, I should turn to Bishop Marsh, because I find in his twentieth lecture, at the 24th page, he thus explains the principle of interpretation, and it seems to me that nothing can be more at variance with the principle upon which Dr. Williams proceeds than this. He says, “Let us apply, then, the principles of interpretation, as explained in a former lecture to the two different cases of history and propheey. When we interpret the words of a sacred historian, and consider those words as signs to the reader of what was thought by the author, we may regard the historian himself as the author. But when we interpret a propheey, we must distinguish between the author and the writer. For when the knowledge of the writer is communicated to him by an immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit, we must consider the Holy Spirit as the author of that knowledge which the prophet, as a writer, communicates to the reader. But then this knowledge might be communicated to the prophet in two different ways, either of which lay within the reach of almighty power. The understanding of the prophet might be opened in a supernatural manner, so as to give him an insight into future events ; while the record of those events, or the mode of committing them to writing, was left entirely to himself. In this case, though the propheey has the Holy Spirit for its author, yet the words of the propheey are the words of the prophet ; and if the prophet was the author of the words, those words must be signs to us of what was thought by the prophet. On the other hand, the words also, as well as the things signified by the words, might have been communicated to the prophet. In this case he was the mere instrument of communication to the reader ; and the Holy Spirit must then be regarded as the author as well with respect to the words, as with respect to the things. But whether the words were chosen by the prophet, or chosen by the Holy Spirit, the principle on which they were chosen must in either case have been the same. In either case the choice of them must have depended on the connection which the usage of the Hebrew language had established between words, and the things signified by those words. If they had not been so chosen, they could not have been signs to the reader of what was thought by the author, whether we refer them to the prophet or refer them to the Holy Spirit.” Then he goes on at length, and then he says at the bottom of the 26th page, “But the prophecies relating to the Messiah are of such importance, that they affect the very truth of our

religion." Now I claim from my learned friend's authority that position. "The prophecies relating to the Messiah are of such importance that they affect the very truth of our religion," and I should be glad to know, if that be a sound position how the denial of any predictive element in the Old Testament by Dr. Williams, can be in accordance with that teaching. Your lordship will remember that it is said that to maintain there is no predictive element in the Old Testament, is within the liberty of the Church of England's formularies, and articles, and teaching. Bishop Marsh does not help it when he says, "The prophecies relating to the Messiah are of such importance that they affect the very truth of our religion," particularly as somebody (I suppose by the direction of the editor) has put "truth of our religion" in italics. Then it goes on, "And in the next place, an inquiry into those prophecies includes the consideration of almost every thing which relates to prophecy in general. It includes the question of primary senses and secondary senses of prophecy. It includes also the question which has been so much agitated under the name of accommodation." When we examine, therefore, the prophecies which relate to the Messiah, we examine every question of real interest in the subject of prophecy at large. Let us begin with an inquiry into that connection which subsists between the truth of our religion and the prophecies relating to the Messiah. It is evident from the writings of the New Testament, that both our Saviour and his Apostles appealed to the prophecies of the Old Testament, as affording a principal proof of his divine mission." That is the position to be found in Dr. Marsh. Then he goes on through those texts which I have already been obliged to read to the Court, as founding that conclusion, that "The prophecies relating to the Messiah are of such importance, that they affect the very truth of our religion." Then in another part, at page 32, he says, "From these repeated appeals to the prophets of the Old Testament, it appears that their testimony is represented in the New Testament as a principal argument for the divine mission of Christ;" and he then says, "It is true that our Saviour appealed also to his miracles;" and he then says, "To perform a miracle is to suspend or counteract in that instance, the general laws of nature; and these are laws which no one but the author of them has the power of suspending or counteracting. When our Saviour, therefore, appealed to his miracles, he appealed to them as a proof, as a legitimate proof, that he was armed with divine authority. And his miracles alone (independently of other

arguments which establish his own true divinity) would be sufficient to prove, as Nicodemus declared, that he was a teacher sent from God." Then follows this passage, "But that connection which subsists between the covenant made with the Jews through Moses, and the covenant made with all mankind through Christ, would be entirely lost were it not for the intervention of the prophecies relating to the Messiah. These prophecies form the link which connects the two covenants. By these prophecies are we enabled to comprehend the whole scheme of Divine Providence, and to understand in what manner it was gradually unfolded for the redemption of mankind."

Bishop Marsh may be right, or Dr. Williams may be right, but they cannot both be right, for two opinions more utterly at variance with each other it would be impossible to cite. "That Jesus of Nazareth therefore was the promised Messiah, is a fact which we must be able to establish, or we shall fail of establishing that comprehensive scheme of Divine Providence, which includes the two covenants in one general system. And we shall otherwise be unable to account for those repeated and solemn appeals to the Hebrew prophets on the part both of Christ and his Apostles. Christ himself has commanded us to search the Scriptures that we may know how they testify of him. We must be able, therefore, to find what he has commanded us to seek, or the command will have been given in vain. His Apostles have further declared that he is the person of whom the prophets did write; that he is the person to whom the prophets gave witness; that he is the person whose preaching was made manifest by the prophets. Unless, therefore, we could show in what manner the prophets did testify of Christ, the declarations that they did so would serve only to confound us; and the argument for the truth of our religion, which we now derive from prophecy, would weaken instead of confirming the argument derived from miracles. The Hebrew prophets, therefore, must have manifestly borne testimony to the coming of Christ. And this testimony must have been so decisive as to admit of no ambiguity, no question, whether their predictions relate to the person of Jesus Christ or not. There must be prophecies, therefore, in the Old Testament, which strictly, literally, and directly predict the coming of our Saviour. There must be something more than passages which may be accommodated, as it is called," (that is by the German writer) "to his life and character. Passages from classic authors are frequently

accommodated, or in other words, applied to a present event, as descriptive of that event."

Dean of the Arches.—Bishop Marsh was a great German scholar.

Dr. Phillimore.—I know he was, my lord. *Michaelis* was a German book.

Dean of the Arches.—He commenced, you know, by writing his celebrated pamphlet on the Treaty of Pilnitz, for which Mr. Pitt gave him a pension; and when he became a bishop, he was so strict a High Churchman, that he framed eighty-seven queries, which he made every candidate for orders answer before he received him.

Dr. Phillimore.—I am obliged to your lordship—I was not in the least aware of that. Bishop Marsh proceeds: "There must likewise be something more in the writings of the Hebrew prophets than passages which predict the coming of Christ, in a sense which is sometimes called remote, at other times secondary, at other times mystical. A prophecy which relates to our Saviour in a more remote or mystical sense, can hardly come within that description of prophecy, by which the preaching of Christ was made manifest. Nor is this the only inconvenience to which we are thus exposed. For if we adopt the notion, that the prophecies in general, which relate to the Messiah, have two senses—a primary and a secondary—we involve prophecy itself in such uncertainty, as to deprive it of the character ascribed to it by St. Peter, who called it the sure word of prophecy. I do not mean to assert that no prophecy in the Old Testament has a secondary sense; but I mean to assert, and shall hereafter endeavour to prove, that the system by which prophecies of the Old Testament are in general supplied with a double meaning is untenable." So that he goes a great deal further than even I should be inclined to put it—he thinks that the exception is their having a double meaning. Well, my lord, Dr. Williams stands in this position that he denies that there is any double meaning at all; he denies that it is prophecy; he says that it is history, and he says that the Church of England allows him to say so.

Now, at page 43, Bishop Marsh goes on: "Let us now consider the examples which strictly and literally relate to the Messiah, though in some of them we shall find many single words which are highly figurative. But I must previously express my obligations on this subject to Bishop Chandler, whom I have chosen for my guide in the selection of those prophecies, which *literally* predict the coming of Christ. Indeed, a better guide on this subject we cannot have. No

man has more clearly perceived the importance of literal prophecy relating to the Messiah." Then he comes to a passage which is upon prophecy generally, and upon this celebrated prophecy of Isaiah which is to be found in lecture 21, at page 55. "In the chapter of Isaiah, which has been just quoted" (that is, the 53rd) "we have a plain and literal description of our Saviour's sufferings, death, and burial; indeed, no less plain and literal than any historical narrative could be, which was written after the events themselves had taken place. And that this literal description is really *literal prophecy* is a matter which cannot be questioned. The only way to prove that it is history, and not prophecy, would be to prove the whole chapter an interpolation in the Book of Isaiah. Now, one should hardly suppose, that it was interpolated by the *Jews*, to whom it is a serious *obstacle*. But if it *is* an interpolation, the Jews alone could have been the authors of it." He deals with that proposition, and disposes of it altogether. Now, my lord, I do not care what Bishop Marsh may have said in any other portion of his works whatever upon the subject of interpretation, because you must take an author's meaning qualified by the context of all his writings, you are not to extract a passage by itself and say, That is the meaning which the author must have meant, when you find the whole scheme of his book opposed to it. You are not to say that Bishop Pearson denied the predictions of our Lord in the Old Testament, when his book is founded upon the validity of those predictions, because he used the word "Messianic" in a particular sense. You are not to say that Bishop Marsh authorised an interpretation of the Bible which would sweep away the doctrines of the Articles, because there is a particular passage in which he dwells upon the advantage of liberty of criticism. And these remarks, my lord, apply to every authority which has been cited; nay, they even apply to an authority which has been cited by my learned friend, which I denied and still deny—to the authority of Baxter—because I am sure that my learned friend was not aware when he cited Baxter as an authority, citing one part of his work, that in 1665, Baxter published a volume, entitled *Baxter's Confession of his Faith*; and that the first section of that confession began in this way: "I do believe the Holy Canonical Scriptures, and all things therein contained, to be infallibly true as being the Word of God." This occurs at page 10. Baxter would be a good deal surprised, supposing surprise reaches people who have left this world; I say Baxter would be a good deal surprised to think that he was

cited in the Court of Arches as an authority for the want of inspiration in the canonical books. But that is the argument on the other side. My lord, I am quite satisfied that when you apply what Dr. Williams calls the spirit of “remorseless criticism” and the “verifying faculty,” to all the authorities which are laid before you, the conclusion which I am satisfied your lordship will arrive at is, that all the attempts to justify Dr. Williams, by bringing him under the shelter of the writings of divines, is obtained by taking on isolated passages or detached expressions from their works, and neglecting either the whole scheme of the work, or the whole context of the chapter.

There was another authority much cited, which I must say a word upon—cited repeatedly by both my learned friends—the authority of Hey: a very strange writer, but certainly a very able one. It is a curious thing, which I may mention in passing, that upon looking the other day into Mackintosh’s *Ethical Philosophy*, page 270, I found this note: “The disposition to compromise, and accommodation which is discoverable in Paley, is carried to its utmost extent by Mr. Hey, a man of much acuteness, and Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.” So that certainly it is a very favourable authority to cite; but I think, when he comes to be examined, he will not be found to support the positions for which he is cited. I dare say my learned friend and I have the same editions, so that I shall have less trouble in finding my way. Mine is the edition of 1822.

Dr. Deane.—My edition is 1841.

Dr. Phillimore.—I have here the very passage. Book i., chapter xii., section 2, was the passage which my learned friend cited, and it was upon the words, “genuine,” “authentic,” “apocryphal,” and “canonical.” My learned friend read it at great length, and it will not be necessary that I should do more than see whether it sustains what he said. In the third section the writer says, “The canonical books are frequently called inspired books, it is therefore right to endeavour to ascertain wherein inspiration consists. Yet here with a view to our own particular method, it may possibly be observed that this is not the place for entering into controversies about inspiration, because all our first book professes to be about theology as common to all sects of Christians,” (a pretty wide subject). “But there is scarce any point about which there is not some difference amongst Christians; and this matter of inspiration does not seem to divide Christians into sects. We will, therefore, content ourselves with men-

tioning a few notions, as we would to heathens ; giving the preference indeed to one, but leaving all Christians to profess their own peculiar notions and systems.” Therefore one does not draw from that preamble any great hope of finding a very distinct statement of the Church of English doctrine. But, however, he goes on to deal with it, and I think it is after a very long discussion indeed which it would be really eiting the whole book to go through. I think either here, or in any one of the other parts of his work, he arrives at a conclusion upon this very article. You see, my lord, from that passage, that he is not explaining the sixth article of religion, but it is the general and preliminary part of his work, and he is going to deal afterwards with the Chureh of England. But he does say, at page 260, the passage I think my learned friend relied upon at the bottom of Book i., chapter xvii., section 19. “One thing which has occasioned difficulty is, quotations of propheecies being introduced with that it might be fulfilled ; but this is mere idiom, it means no more than *à propos* does in French, or than our saying, I dreamt of you last night ; now I meet you, my dream is out. A continued and habitual reference to prophecy might generate or give occasion to such a mode of expression.” It shows, I must say, very great levity in speaking at all in that way of a passage which is to be found in the Scriptures, but he does not in the least intend—(though my learned friend meant to convey that impression to the Court, for the rest of his work sufficiently confutes the notion)—I say he does not in the least intend to imply that prophecy was not fulfilled, or that there was not a predictive element in prophecy ; and if he does not intend to say, that by it, it is merely quoting one rather loose and careless expression of a writer who has written four volumes upon the subject. The question is whether in these four volumes upon the subject, and whether in the part which he specially dedicates to that consideration he has said anything to support Dr. Williams’s views. Therefore, I will turn from that isolated passage, and will turn from that isolated passage, and will see what he does say upon the sixth article itself. I think it is pretty well seen in Book iv., article vii., section 9, this is upon the point. Observe, my lord, Hey, is cited to justify Dr. Williams in maintaining that there is no predictive element in prophecy. Now see how he subserves this purpose. “From explanation we proceed to proof ; and here our first proposition is, properly, ‘The Old Testament is not contrary to the New ;’ but by what has been said in the explanation, this proposition

is equivalent to the following; ‘Everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ,’ in the Old Testament. This proposition might be proved by declarations of the Old Testament, as well as by the types of futurity there mentioned. But with regard to types, they were treated in the first book; and in our reading of Bishop Pearson on the Creed, we find no part of our Saviour’s history, which is not shown to have been presignified by them; and with regard to declarations, promises, predictions, perhaps we may as well take them into our proof of the next proposition, concerning the actual expectation of the most eminent Jews; for though it is one thing to show that the Old Testament does offer to mankind, through Christ, everlasting life, and another, that the leading Jews or patriarchs understood such offer, and founded expectations upon it; yet, as every proof of the offer must afford some argument for its being acknowledged, we may as well incorporate the proofs of the two propositions together.” And then he goes on, showing at great length throughout the article all the prophecies which did relate to our Saviour. At very considerable length he goes through the article setting forth all the prophecies of our Lord, and at page 66, using the same argument which has been always used, he says, “The authority of the New Testament must have the greatest weight. Therefore, we will select a few passages relating to Abraham, Moses, and David, and then a few relating to the eminent persons of the Old Dispensation collectively. As to Abraham, John, viii., 56, seems decisive; whenever it was that he saw the day of Christ; but I must confess that Bishop Warburton’s account appears to me not only ingenious but probable.” Then he goes on proving from the references to the prophecies of the Old Testament in the New, that they must be Divine—and somewhere (I shall lay my hand upon it in a minute or two) he gives an explanation of inspiration, which I remember when I looked at it thinking it was one which I should be very content to abide by.

Then, my lord, there was Horne’s *Introduction to the Scriptures* cited, to which I am not about to refer, for I do not in any way quarrel with it; and I observe from my notes, that your lordship put to my learned friend the question, whether Dr. Williams had ever denied the secondary sense, and my learned friend, I think, made answer, “Never the secondary sense in its fulfilment,” which was a very careful answer indeed, because what Dr. Williams does say in substance is, that there were fine moral qualities ascribed in Isaiah, to somebody wholly different to our Lord, though it was impossible not to

see that our Lord had those moral qualities. That is what my learned friend calls “the secondary sense in its fulfilment;” but of course that is wholly and entirely a different sense from that which Our Lord and His apostles themselves used, when they referred specifically to the time, the place, and the circumstances, according to the various passages I have read. Those references by them were in an entirely different sense altogether. My learned friend who spoke after him very gallantly, and very ably contended at once, that it was not necessary that he should maintain that there was a predictive element in that sense, not only (and that the Court will carefully distinguish) not only that the prophet should not have been aware that the prophecy related to Our Lord, for instance, which was quite another matter, but that the Holy Spirit had not dictated to the prophet the prediction of Our Lord, or of particular events. My lord, I have found the passage in Hey, which my learned friend did cite, and I have no objection to adopt it. It is in the same page, book i., chapter 12, section 3. “Some men have been of opinion that every word of Scripture was inspired, and therefore that the sacred writers were mere instruments. This Bishop Warburton calls organic inspiration, and I suppose Dr. Priestly means the same by plenary inspiration; this seems the highest degree of supposed inspiration, the Socinians seem to take the lowest, Dr. Priestly says” (that is the Socinian, I presume). “That St. Paul knew nothing of the Fall of Man, but from the writings of Moses; and that his writings abound with analogies and antithesis, on which no very serious stress is to be laid. But such as seem to me the most judicious and learned men, suppose that the sacred writers were informed supernaturally as to the substance of the Christian scheme, and were left to their own habits of speaking, as far as related to the modes of expression.” That is utterly and entirely at variance with the doctrine of Dr. Williams, for there is nothing at all supernatural according to his statements; there is nothing of the kind, and nothing partaking of it, any more than you might say in a very high flown and strange manner of speech, that there is something supernatural in Milton’s poem. You may do so. You may play upon words in that way, but you are not speaking the language of orthodox divinity, or the recognised language of the English Church when you so speak.

Well, my lord, subject to the remarks which I made upon the form of the article in which I stated that if it was supposed that we had not sufficiently extracted passages, we

world reform by extracting more, subject to that remark that would dispose of the seventh Article, because in dealing with that, the whole question was involved, my lord, of canonicity and of no inspiration, and of the predictive element in prophecy, which I was obliged, as I am sure your lordship will see, to take separate and apart from the technical consideration of each article, because it would have been impossible otherwise to have avoided a repetition of the argument upon each successive article. My learned friends adopted that course, and it was a very convenient one of taking certain general principles which were involved in the question of the admissibility of the Articles, and dealing with them apart from the Articles themselves. Therefore, subject to these remarks upon the form, I think that would be my answer as to the admissibility of the seventh Article. I should say, therefore, that it would stand as charging an ecclesiastical offence; that, in other words, the natural and plain construction of the passages which we have selected when compared with the context, warrants the conclusion which we have derived from them at page 4, that the assertion that the Scripture is an expression of "devout reason," and "the written voice of the congregation," and the other expressions therein recited do amount to a declaration that the Scripture is not the Word of God, nor containing any special revelation of his Truth, or of his dealings with mankind, nor of the rule of our faith; and that it is contrary to the sixth, seventh, and twentieth Articles, and that it is contrary to that passage in the Nicene Creed, which says that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets, contrary to the Book of Common Prayer; and to that passage of Holy Scripture appointed to be read concerning the admissibility of which your lordship reserves your judgment. It might, I think, have also been said, that it was not only contrary to the passage, "The Holy Ghost spake by the prophets," but also it would be difficult to say how our Lord rose again according to the Scriptures, upon the statements contained in Dr. Williams's essay. Therefore, my lord, the argument upon all these great principles will extend itself of course, more or less over the question of the admissibility of all the Articles; but, at present, my lord, I think I may pass on to the consideration of the eighth Article.

The eighth Article makes an extract from pages 65, 66, and 67, and it also includes a statement with regard to the prophetic element. It might therefore be said to have been dealt with in the other article; but some arguments have been advanced here, which I wish to deal with before I pass on. The seventh

and eighth might both be disposed of as coming under those great heads which I have mentioned. My lord, there is a remark to be made upon this eighth Article, in addition to what I have said. In the extract in the 8th Article, the writer says, and that may be urged perhaps in his favour. “Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic; others restricted this character to five. Paley ventures to quote only one.” I pray in aid of my argument as to the meaning which the writer attaches to “Messianic,” that passage: “Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic.” Bishop Chandler in these passages, is referring generally to our Saviour, and not to the particular sense which my learned friend referred to in Bishop Pearson, and therefore, from the writer’s own showing, he did not use “Messianic” in the sense of referring to the Messiah alone, but as generally referring to our Lord. It is clear from that very passage, “Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic,” that there is no such limitation there.

Then, my lord, as to Paley, you will find that this is an instance of very unfair statement. Dr. Williams says, “Paley ventures to quote only one.” At page 212, this is what Paley says, it is in part ii., chapter 1, on prophecy, and after giving the whole of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, he fills it up by these words, “There are other prophecies of the Old Testament interpreted by Christians to relate to the Gospel history, which are deserving both of great regard, and of a very attentive consideration; but I content myself with stating the above, as well because I think it the clearest and the strongest of all, as because most of the rest, in order that their value be represented with any tolerable degree of fidelity, require a discussion unsuitable to the limits and nature of this work.” Paley dwells upon the great importance of that chapter, the 53rd of Isaiah, as a prediction of our Lord, but not more so, I think, than many other writers to whom I have referred your lordship; they all consider it as the most Evangelical chapter in the Evangelical prophet.

Your lordship will see that the statement of the reviewer, with respect to the Book of Daniel, is that those portions of the work supposed to be especially predictive, are a history of past occurrences up to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Therefore, it is a clear proof that the predictive element (as it is admitted indeed) is altogether excluded from his theory of prophecy. I may say it is one of the clearest proofs.

I now read these passages, to which your lordship's attention has been already drawn. "When so vast an induction on the destructive side has been gone through, it avails little that some passages may be doubtful; one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messianic, and a chapter possibly in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem." That has been gone through, and I think that I should notice also, in passing (though it is difficult to say whether it should not come in on the hearing of the cause, rather than on the contention for the admission of the articles), what is said about Jeremiah. I beg the Court to observe that we contend, and have pleaded, in one of our latest articles that the reviewer has adopted entirely the view of Bunsen in almost all respects, as here, with respect to the person predicted by Isaiah, being Jeremiah, and not our Lord. My lord, as to this kind of fiction which Bunsen adopts, upon which I will say a word in bidding farewell to this article, the notion of two or three Isaiahs and two or three Jeremiahs, is exactly characteristic of the mode of speculation which Dr. Williams thinks ought to be adopted. First of all, they make a chronology on speculation, then they make a history to suit the chronology, and then they make a Bible to suit the speculation; and I dare say somebody hereafter will say that there were two Bunsens—one a very sensible man who said the prayers, which Dr. Williams seems to wonder that he did say; and another, a man who said and wrote the extravagant nonsense which he did about the Old and New Testament.

My lord, I come to the ninth article, which contains these passages: "In distinguishing the man Daniel from our book of Daniel, and in bringing the latter as low as the reign of Epiphanes, our author only follows the admitted necessities of the case. The truth seems that, starting like many a patriot bard of our own, from a name traditionally sacred, the writer used it with no deceptive intention, as a dramatic form, which dignified his encouragement of his countrymen in their great struggle against Antiochus. The original place of the book, amongst the later Hagiography of the Jewish canon, and the absence of any mention of it by the Son of Sirach, strikingly confirm this view of its origin; and, if some obscurity rests upon details, the general conclusion, that the book contains no predictions, except by analogy and type, can hardly be gainsaid. But it may not the less, with some of the latest Psalms, have nerved the men of Israel, when they turned to flight the armies of the aliens; and it suggests, in the godless invader

no slight forecast of Caligula again invading the Temple with like abomination, as well as whatever exalts itself against faith and conscience to the end of the world. It is time for divines"—these are words which clearly show the adoption of the writer—"to recognise these things; since, with their opportunities of study, the current error is as discreditable to them as for the well-meaning crowd, who are taught to identify it with their creed, it is a matter of grave compassion"—that is to say, to speak quite plainly, to believe that Daniel contains a prediction of our Lord upon our Lord's authority, is a matter of grave compassion, and a current error and discreditable. "It provokes a smile on serious topics, to observe the zeal with which our critic indicates the personality of Jonah, and doubts the originality of his hymn." That irreverent language has been read quite often enough to the Court, and I will not go further into it. The same argument applies to that as applies to the other passage. I would observe that the charge made against Dr. Williams, which has been used, is not merely a denial of the authorship simply and solely of those works which he is charged with denying, but a denial of the authorship, coupled with a denial of something else also at the same time. Now, in this case, it is not merely the authorship of Jonah that is denied, but it is the personality of Jonah and the truth of the historical facts connected with him. I have shown the Court (anticipating this part of my argument) in several citations which I made, how Jonah was personally referred to by our Lord; and I made that argument, which I call the argument of the dilemma as to our Lord and the Apostles being deceivers or deceived, which I need not again repeat. I will now go on to the tenth article; this passage is taken from the 84th page of this book, or rather from the 83rd, 84th, and 85th pages, and the note numbered 3. The passage selected is—"Our author then believes St. Paul, because he understands him reasonably. Nor does his acceptance of Christ's redemption from evil bind him to repeat traditional fictions about our canon, or to read its pages with that dullness which turns symbol and poetry into materialism. On the side of history lies the strength of his genius. His treatment of the New Testament is not very unlike the acute criticism of De Wette, tempered by the affectionateness of Neander." That, perhaps, might have admitted of a good deal of explanation from the schools of German theology. "He finds in the first three Gospels divergent forms of the tradition—once oral and, perhaps, catechetical, in the congregations of the Apostles. He thus

explains the numerous traces characteristic of a traditional narrative. He does not ascribe the quadruple division of record to the four churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, on the same principle as liturgical families are traced; but he requires time enough for some development, and for the passing of some symbol into story. By making the fourth Gospel the latest of all our genuine books, he accounts for its style (so much more Greek than the Apocalypse), and explains many passages." Then this passage follows: "The verse, 'And no man hath ascended up to Heaven but he that came down,' is intelligible, as a free comment, near the end of the first century, but has no meaning in our Lord's mouth at a time when the Ascension had not been heard of."

Now, my lord, is a statement of that kind also within the liberty of a clergyman who has subscribed our Articles? I do pray your lordship's particular attention to that, because I may be mistaken—my learned friend will correct me if I am. I do not remember that any argument whatever was addressed to your lordship in defence of that position. I do not remember that either of the learned counsel for Dr. Williams attempted to defend it. I must ask your lordship most seriously to consider the consequences of admitting that such a position as that is within the liberty of interpretation allowed by the Articles of the Church; and I ask your lordship to see how it confirms all that I have been addressing to you upon the subject of interpretation; how it shows that if that new doctrine of interpretation may be extended, as it is proposed to do, to get rid of distinct passages in the Old and the New Testament, there is no security or safety whatever for the people of this country that any portion of their Bible may not be mutilated and expurgated of its most material doctrines and its most comforting assurances, under the pretext that among the various versions, Hebrew or Greek, somebody has arrived at an interpretation which makes it intelligible as a free comment, near the end of the first century, but it has no meaning in our Lord's mouth.

Dr. Deane.—If my learned friend will allow me, I will answer his question. It is no part of the indictment, and therefore it was no part of our business to deal with it.

Dr. Phillimore.—I was quite correct in my statement—the indictment is, that it is altogether an error—the error denied, is with respect to the Revelation of St. John.

I did not put words into your mouth. If you say that you had an argument, and you did not offer it, that puts an end to

it : but I should have said, from your silence upon a very important passage, which you knew was in complete accordance with the whole of the argument against you, that you really had no argument to use against it. If you tell me that you have an argument, I can only say that I am sorry you exercised so extremely bad a discretion as not to have used it. I mean most strongly to insist upon it, nor can I think for a moment that anything so paltry could be listened to as this, that when a passage is extracted and put into an article of this offensive character, it could be supposed, owing to what is called an omission in the charging part (that is to say, the substance of the offence afterwards stated), that no answer was to be given to that ; it must be perfectly obvious that that might be altered by a stroke of the pen at any moment. It is perfectly obvious that a more technical objection was never opposed to a very serious charge. I am not aware that it is not properly laid,* but assume for a moment that it was so ; the passage which I have selected is this : “ And no man hath ascended up to Heaven but He that came down, is intelligible as a free comment near the end of the first century, but has no meaning in our Lord’s mouth at a time when the Ascension had not been heard of.” We go on to charge Dr. Williams that he did advisedly maintain that the portion of Holy Scripture, usually called the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the Epistle usually called the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle usually called the Epistle of St. Peter, are not respectively parts of Holy Scripture whose authority is binding upon the Church, and that he did therein advisedly maintain such a doctrine. Very well, my lord, I will admit, for the sake of that, we should have therefore to ask you to put in that, “ and you did also in that statement ” the verse “ And no man hath ascended up to Heaven but He that came down,” is intelligible as a free comment near the end of the first century ; but has no meaning in our Lord’s mouth at a time when the Ascension had not been heard of, deny the authenticity of the Scripture in which that passage is contained, and in which our Lord is made to say these words.” Then it goes on :—“ So that the Apocalypse, if taken as a series of poetical visions, which represent the outpourings of the vials of wrath upon the city where the Lord was slain, ceases to be a riddle. Its horizon answers to that of Jerusalem already threatened by

* In the later case of *Fendal v. Williams*, it was contended that the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon the question of pleading was given upon Articles under the severe statute of 13 Elizabeth, c. 12, not upon articles like these under the *general canon law*.

the legions of Vespasian, and its language is partly adapted from the older prophets, partly a repetition of our Lord's warnings as described by the Evangelists, or as deepened into wilder threatenings in the mouth of the later Jesus, the son of Ananus. The Epistle to the Hebrews, so different in its conception of faith, and in its Alexandrine rhythm from the doctrine of St. Paul's known Epistles, has its degree of discrepancy explained by ascribing it to some companion of the Apostles; and minute reasons are found for fixing it with probability on Apollos. The second of the Petrine Epistles having alike external and internal evidence against its genuineness, is necessarily surrendered as a whole: and our critic's good faith in this respect is more certain than the ingenuity with which he reconstructs a part of it. The second chapter may not improbably be a quotation; but its quoter, and the author of the rest of the Epistle, need not therefore have been St. Peter." Well, my lord, the charging part here is, "that the portion of Holy Scripture usually called the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the Epistle usually called the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle usually called the Epistle of St. Peter, are not respectively parts of Holy Scripture, whose authority is binding upon the Church," and that that opinion was maintained by Dr. Williams, and is inconsistent with the sixth of the Articles.

Now, here comes in the note which I anticipated a little time back. The Court will see the note at the bottom of page 10. In my own judgment, the Epistle bears traces of being post-apostolic. Upon that I wish to observe, that it is not merely therefore a charge upon the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but it is a direct statement that the Epistle to the Hebrews was post-apostolic. Now, of course, if the Epistle to the Hebrews was post-apostolic, it could not, under any latitude of definition, come within the canonical Scriptures. The whole argument as to the division being made into canonical and uncanonical Scriptures, which was gone into at great length, would be at variance with it. The whole principle on which the selection was made, would be at variance with it. If it was written after apostolic times, no book of this description is admitted in the category of canonical, and it would be upon the same footing as the Apocrypha; and so, my lord, with regard to the selection of the passage from the Revelation. A great deal has been said by my learned friend upon the question of the date of St. John's Gospel, which I think is not exactly in question here. The point is the reference to the passage from the Revelation for

the Epistle, and what St. John says of our Lord—that I do not find to have been dealt with—“so the Apocalypse, if taken as a series of poetical visions.” Then, my lord, it is to be considered and decided whether it is competent or not to a clergyman to ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to a post-apostolic period, and whether it is competent to him to deny the second of the Petrine Epistles, and whether it is competent to him to deny its reference to our Lord ; that would rest upon the argument which has been already addressed to your lordship, and which need not be repeated. If your lordship is of opinion that that is consistent with unfeignedly believing the canonical Scriptures, of course it is admissible ; but if it is not consistent with an unfeigned belief in the canonical Scriptures, of course it is inadmissible, and it is without the latitude claimed. But of course we should ask if it be technically necessary to have this passage from St. John put into the charging part, and if the Articles were to be re-formed, we should request to have that amongst the re-formations.

Now, my lord, we come to the eleventh article, and the eleventh article relates to a passage taken from the 56th, 59th, 60th, and 61st pages of the book. “Our deluge takes its place among geological phenomena, no longer a disturbance of law from which science shinks, but a prolonged play of the forces of fire and water, rendering the primeval regions of North Asia uninhabitable.” This includes a very serious passage, which is this ; “Baron Bunsen notices the high hand with which Jehovah led forth his people, the spoiling of the Egyptians, and the lingering in the Peninsula, as signs, even in the Bible, of a struggle conducted by human means. Thus, as the pestilence of the book of Kings becomes in Chronicles the more visible angel, so the avenger who slew the first born may have been the Bedouin host, akin nearly to Jethro.”

Dean of the Arches.—Which article are you now reading ?

Dr. Phillimore.—I am reading the eleventh.

Dean of the Arches.—Is that the commencement of it ?

Dr. Phillimore.—No, my lord. I have read the other portion ; it is at the top of page 11 ; it begins over leaf, my lord ; the preceding part had related to the Deluge. Then comes this part, “Thus as the pestilence of the book of Kings becomes in Chronicles the more visible angel, so the avenger who slew the first born, may have been the Bedouin host akin nearly to Jethro, and more remotely to Israel ;” and then it proceeds, “So in the passage of the Red Sea, the description may be interpreted with the latitude of poetry ; though as it is not affirmed that Pharaoh was drowned, it is no serious

objection that Egyptian authorities continue the reign of Menepthah later. A greater difficulty is, that we find that three centuries thus left us from the Exodus to Solomon's Temple. Yet less stress will be laid upon this by whoever notices how the numbers in the book of Judges proceed by the eastern round number of forty, what traces the whole book bears of embodying history in its most popular form, and how naturally St. Paul or St. Stephen would speak after received accounts." An then there comes this passage, which is about the most objectionable in the whole work. "When the fierce ritual of Syria, with the awe of a divine voice, bade Abraham slay his son, he did not reflect that he had no perfect theory of the absolute, to justify him in departing from traditional revelation, but trusted that the Father, whose voice from Heaven he heard at heart, was better pleased with mercy than with sacrifice, and his trust was his righteousness. Its seed was sown from heaven, but it grew in the soil of an honest and good heart; so in each case we trace principles of reason and right to which our heart perpetually responds, and our response to which is a truer sign of faith than such deference to a supposed external authority as would quench these principles themselves"—your lordship remarks the expression "to a supposed external authority as would quench these principles themselves." And you remember what is said at the close of the essay, about "the fiction of an external revelation." Well, my lord, we say that the substance of this is, "that the statements of Holy Scripture as to historical facts may be read and understood in a wholly figurative sense, and in a non-natural sense, of the plain words and purport thereof," or that he "did therein advisedly maintain or affirm" such a doctrine. First of all, my lord, is that a correct inference from those passages? What do they do? They dispose of the Deluge as described in the Bible. "It is no longer a disturbance of law from which science shrinks, but a prolonged play of the forces of fire and water, rendering the primeval regions of North Asia uninhabitable, and urging the nations to new abodes." It disposes of the plain statement of the Deluge; it disposes of the great miracle of the slaying of the first born; it disposes altogether, not, perhaps, altogether, but it disposes partially of the passage of the Red Sea, and it disposes entirely of what I believe has hitherto been considered one of the most important passages in the Old Testament, namely, the offering up of Isaac. And of course it would be very important indeed for your lordship to consider here whether the lesson for the evening service of the first

Sunday in Lent, can be admitted, and also whether the 22nd chapter of the 1st book of Moses can be admitted.

My lord, with regard to all these assertions, first of all, it cannot be denied here that the reviewer identifies himself with the author. And I say, are these statements consistent with an unfeigned belief in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. If they are consistent with it, what amount of this belief is inconsistent with it? I do not say that the inevitable consequences of a proposition are always an infallible proof of the intention of the propounder, but they afford a very considerable argument in cases of this description, and I should really be glad to know how it would be possible, if the Court admits this doctrine, that these may be explained away, for that is the plain meaning of it. I say I should really be glad to know what other passages in Scripture might not be explained away.

All that I have said with regard to the incorporation of the Scriptures of the Old Testament in the New, the whole of that argument applies again here. It applies in the most remarkable way, as your lordship is aware, in the case of Abraham and Isaac, and therefore if these are admissible passages, this consequence would clearly follow, that a clergyman is not restrained from dissolving into allegory, passages which have been adapted and applied by our Lord or by his Apostles in the New Testament, as historical facts of the most solemn and real character. That would be one consequence which would follow. The other consequence that would follow is that it would be left entirely to each person's selection to say what he considered to be plain, historical statement and what he considered to be allegorical; what was inspired, and what was uninspired. What would the Bible be when each person had exercised his discretion in this way? What remaining security would there be that all the portions of the Bible would not be got rid of? That is exactly what has happened in Germany. They had a subscription in Germany; and after trying a subscription to all Luther's works, and finding that that was an impossible thing, they got a subscription to this effect, "So far as they are consistent with the Scriptures," and under those large words there have been professors of theology like Strauss, who has explained without difficulty, or the least remorse, the whole Bible, all the facts of the Bible, away, and have said that they were every one of them myths and allegories. Well, my lord, the object of the thirty-nine Articles, and of our formularies, as I understand them, is to prevent clerks from so dealing with the Bible. The object

of these formularies is to bind persons down to certain positions or articles extracted from the Bible. According to the argument of my learned friends, surely there should be some explanation that at the time of ordination, when the authorised version of the Bible is delivered to the deacon, and he is asked whether he unfeignedly believes it, it is competent for him to say, “Yes, I unfeignedly believe all it contains, but I do not believe it does contain what strictly speaking it does contain ; I believe it contains certain allegories, but I do not believe it contains a record of actual facts.” My lord, I can only say that it may be my obtuseness, but I am not able to see where a line of demarcation should be drawn upon this point, I mean as to the admission or retention of the historical narratives in the Old Testament. I am utterly unable, I say, to see where the line can be drawn, and I should think it a very great hardship if I were a clergyman of the Church of England, and it was judicially pronounced that Dr. Williams might substitute a totally different version (for I shall show you that it is a totally different version of the offering up of Isaac from that which is given in the plain language of the Bible), and I might not offer a totally different version of any other passage in the Bible which did not happen to agree with my speculations.

Dean of the Arches.—Are you going to a new head, Dr. Phillimore?

Dr. Phillimore.—Yes, my lord ; and I must, I am afraid, take some little time upon it.

Dean of the Arches.—Then we had better adjourn.

Dr. Phillimore.—Returning to where I left off yesterday, I will supply one omitted citation. That citation is from Boone’s *Sermons on the Theory of Belief*, a most distinguished and accomplished writer, now, I am sorry to say, no more.

The title is, *On Development of Religion*. “Where is the practical difference, whether we contend that all is God, or that nothing is God ? Let me illustrate the point by the case of inspiration. There is no such thing as inspiration, says one class of objectors ; inspiration is everywhere, and in all things, says another class. The Greek dramas are as much inspired as the Book of Job, the odes of Pindar are as much inspired as the psalms of David, Homer and Shakespeare are as much inspired as St. Paul. You will observe that I am not here asking what inspiration is, or discussing any theories concerning it. But who can doubt that the true differential idea of Scriptural inspiration is as completely destroyed by

the latter of these averments as by the former? Still more certainly the true distinctive idea of God is destroyed by Pantheism no less than by Atheism; and they amount, in fact, to the same thing."

My lord, upon the eleventh Article it will not be necessary to read the selected passages again. The first objection is to the account of the Deluge which is given by Dr. Williams, and we say it is at variance with the teaching of the Church. It is only necessary to refer your lordship on this point to two chapters in Genesis, one, chap. vi., verse 17:

"And behold, I even I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven, and everything that is in the earth shall die."

The other is chap. ix., beginning at verse 11: "And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth.

"And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations.

"I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.

"And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud.

"And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh, and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.

"And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth."

My lord, this is a plain matter of construction. If Dr. Williams adopts this opinion, "Our deluge takes its place among geological phenomena, no longer a disturbance of law from which science shrinks, but a prolonged play of the forces of fire and water, rendering the primeval regions of North Asia uninhabitable, and urging the nations to new abodes," he distinctly denies that the miraculous record that I have read to your lordship is true.

I come to the next question, viz., whether it is competent to Dr. Williams to say, with regard to the Exodus: "Thus, as the pestilence of the Book of Kings becomes in Chronicles the more visible angel, so the Avenger who slew the firstborn may have been the Bedouin host, akin nearly to Jethro, and more remotely to Israel."

In the first place, I must say it is one of the many instances in which the extreme carelessness and negligence of Dr. Williams is to be traced. Just as he was quite wrong about Bishop Chandler, and quite wrong about Paley, so he is quite wrong in his citations from Scripture. If the Court compare the two passages cited, it will find there is not that difference which Dr. Williams (whose learning is to be a model for the Church of England) supposes. In the second Book of Kings, chap. xix., verse 35, there is the passage to which Dr. Williams refers. It is thus stated: "And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourseore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses." Dr. Williams says, "Thus as the pestilence of the Book of Kings becomes in Chronicles the more visible angel." Why, the "visible angel," is distinctly stated in the passage I have read to your lordship. "It came to pass that night the angel of the lord went out." The passage in the second Book of Chronicles will be found in chapter xxxii., verse 21, "And the lord sent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land." The angel of the Lord is equally mentioned in both passages.

That is only another proof the carelessness of the writer. Then he goes on, "So the avenger who slew the first-born may have been the Bedouin host, akin nearly to Jethro, and more remotely to Israel." Now, the passage in Exodus is chapter xii., verse 23; and what says the Book of Exodus? "For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your house to smite you. And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever, and it shall come to pass when ye be come to the land which the Lord will give you, according as he hath promised, that ye shall keep this service. And it shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, what mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses, And the people bowed the head and worshipped. And the children of Israel went away and did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they, And it came to pass, that at midnight the Lord smote

all the first born in the land of Egypt, from the first born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first born of the captive that was in the dungeon ; and all the first born of cattle."

It is said, that this miracle might have been effected by "the Bedouin host ;" why "the Bedouin host" were to have picked out the "first born" is of course a matter of criticism ; but it is suggested that the Lord may have effected this miracle through "the Bedouin host." All I can say, is that Holy Writ says no such thing ; Holy Writ says quite differently ; Holy Writ gives a distinct account of one of the most remarkable miracles in the Old Testament : that remarkable miracle in the Old Testament is referred to in the New Testament. I deny as a mere question of construction, that it can be competent to a clergyman of the Church of England to say, that when Holy Writ says, "the Lord made all the first born in the land of Egypt," it means "the Bedouin host."

My lord, I say on the same principle on which you might read, "the Bedouin host" here, you might explain and alter any passage in Scripture. I know the answer that is given. The answer my friend gave by anticipation in his opening speech was, "you reconcile people to the Bible in this way ; people cannot understand these things without these historical illustrations ; if you alter the Scriptures you reconcile people to them." It reminds me of a reply, which I have somewhere read, that Armand made to Boileau on a similar occasion. Boileau proposed to alter the Bible with the same object, and Armand made this remarkable reply to him, "Mon ami, vous gagnerez deux ou trois impiés et vous perdrez je ne sais combien d'honnêtes gens." "You may, perhaps, convert two or three infidels, you will certainly destroy the faith of innumerable simple-minded believers."

In the same way, Dr. Williams treats the miracle of the Red Sea. I do not exactly understand why it is said Pharaoh was not drowned. That is a matter of construction. I should have read the psalm in a different way, but Dr. Williams says, the description is to be interpreted with the latitude of poetry. He does not say, "it pleased God on that occasion to make use of natural means to effect a miracle," *i.e.* he made use of a particular wind which blew in that direction, to raise the waves to such a height that the Israelites passed through, which was an ingenious theory suggested (though not in those terms) by a great divine. It would have been quite a different thing if Dr. Williams had stated in plain and intelligible language, "it pleased God to work a miracle, but

to work it by human means." But no such statement as that is to be found from one end of the article to the other. It is simply an argument made use of by his advocate to cover the plain contradiction between Dr. Williams and the Bible.

My lord, I pass on to that which is the most important of all, the passage contained in the fourth extract about the offering of Isaac. I must read to your lordship very shortly what the Bible says, because it can only be done by comparing the two together. "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham; and he said, Behold, here I am; and he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

"And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Issac his son, and cleave the wood for the burnt offering, and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him.

"Then on the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw the place afar off.

"And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass; and I and the lad will go yonder and worship and come again to you.

"And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand and a knife; and they went both of them together.

"And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father and said, My father; and he said, Here am I my son, And he said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?

"And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together.

"And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood.

"And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son.

"And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham, and he said here am I.

"And he said, lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him; for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou has not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

“ And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and beheld bebind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns ; and Abraham went and took the ram and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.

“ And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh, as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen.

“ And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the secound time.

“ And said, by myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son.

“ That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore ; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.

“ And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.”

The Gospel according to St. Luke, chap. i., verse 67, begins in this way :—

“ And his father, Zacharias, was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying,

“ Blessed be the Lord God of Israel ; for he hath visited and redeemed his people.

“ And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David.

“ As he spake by the mouth of his Holy prophets, which have been since the world began.

“ That we should be saved from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us.

“ To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his Holy Covenant.

“ The oath which he swore to our father Abraham—

“ That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear.”

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. vi., verse 13 :—

“ For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.

“ Saying, surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.

“ And so after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.”

In the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, verse 17, it is said :—

“ By faith, Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac ; and he that had received the promises, offered up his only begotten son.

“ Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

“ Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead ; from whence also he received him in a figure.”

Now, my lord, I ask whether it is possible, by any fair mode of construction, to reconcile that distinct prophecy and Divine record, given in the Old, confirmed in the New Testament, with the account in this passage from Dr. Williams's essay ? “ When the fierce ritual of Syria, with the awe of a Divine voice, bade Abraham slay his son, he did not reflect that he had no perfect theory of the absolute to justify him in departing from traditional revelation.” Why, my lord, not only is the construction different, but the whole story is different. The solution here is that Moloch, the author of the fierce ritual of Syria, suggested to Abraham the sacrifice of his child ; that Abraham disobeyed the voice of God in his conscience, and was about to sacrifice the child—“ not reflecting that he had no perfect theory of the absolute,” (whatever that may mean)—“ not reflecting that he had no perfect theory of the absolute to justify him in departing from traditional revelation ; but trusted that the Father, whose voice from heaven he heard at heart, was better pleased with mercy than with sacrifice, and his trust was his righteousness. Its seed was sown from heaven, but it grew in the soil of an honest and good heart. So, in each case, we trace principles of reason and right, to which our heart perpetually responds ; and our response to which is a truer sign of faith than such deference to a supposed external authority, as would quench these principles themselves.”

My lord, it would be really difficult to conceive two statements more entirely at variance as to their purport and meaning, and also as to their language. It is attempted to be justified, so far as I recollect—I am sure I mean to state my friend's argument quite fairly—it is attempted to be justified by reference to a speculation of a learned divine ; and it is said, if Bishop Warburton entertained and published the opinion he did, there is nothing extraordinary in this statement by Dr. Williams. My lord, the passage referred to in Warburton, is in his celebrated work of the *Divine Legation* ; and I would suggest to your lordship it may possibly be one of those chapters which it will be incumbent on the Court to

read—to read legally; I mean with a view to this question. If, indeed, it could be shown that so great a divine as Warburton entertained anything like the idea which is expressed by Dr. Williams, it might well excite surprise. But even then, according to my view of the observations in the Gorham Case and in Burder and Heath, it would not bring the writer of this essay within the scope of the principle there laid down; because it is impossible that one isolated opinion in a book of general orthodoxy could cover a gross heresy. However, even admitting for the sake of the argument, that the principle could be carried to that extent, your lordship will find nothing of the kind in this chapter of the *Divine Legation*.

It is a totally different statement. I will state in a few words what Warburton's theory was. It was not only built on the admission that the account in Genesis was a most important historical record of a Divine interposition, but he carried the value of the record even further than others had done, because he said that the three days during which Abraham remained with Isaac in Mount Moriah, were typical of the period between the Crucifixion and Resurrection of the Saviour. To appeal to Warburton, therefore, as an authority upon this subject, is like quoting Lowth against the predictive element in prophecy, when, by his translation of the 53rd of Isaiah, he has shown it was even more than predictive.

In vol. v., book vi., sec. 5, 11, Warburton says:—"To the second point, which is to show that the command to offer up Isaac was the very revelation of Christ's day, or the redemption of mankind by his death and sufferings," that is the thesis which the learned writer proposes to himself, and he goes on and says, "We conclude, and surely not unreasonably, that there is something more in the command than these interpreters, resting in the outside relation, have yet discovered to us." I will not now read the whole chapter, and it will be impossible to understand fully the argument unless your lordship will, at least, glance over the chapter, if you think it of sufficient consequence. I only read those passages which I think are of importance to my argument. He goes on to say, "We must needs conclude that the command was not according to the common notion, a trial only, because it comes after all God's dispensations. Yet, as the sacred text assures us, it was a trial; and as a trial necessarily precedes the employment and reward of the person tried, we must needs conclude that, as no employment, so some benefit followed this trial. Now, on our interpretation, a benefit, as we shall see, did follow.

We have reason, therefore, to conclude that this interpretation is the true.” Then he goes on, “ We see, as was said before, how all God’s revelations to him, to this last, ultimately related to that mystical, fundamental promise made to him on his first vocation, that in him should all families of the earth be blessed. God opens the scheme of his dispensations by exact and regular steps; and the revelations follow one another gradually, and in order. Abraham is first commanded to go into a land which should be shown to him; then that land, to be possessed by his numerous posterity, is exhibited before him. Its distinct boundaries are afterwards marked out. He is next assured, while yet childless, that his posterity, to which so much was promised, should not be from an adopted son, but from out of his own loins. He is then told that this son should be born of Sarah, which is followed by a formal execution of the covenant confirmed by the Seal of Circumcision. After all this, the birth of Isaac is predicted, who being born at the appointed time; Ishmael is ordered to be sent away, to design with more certainty the succession of the son by Sarah. Here we see throughout, a gradual opening, and fit preparative for some farther revelation, which in pursuance of this regular scheme of progressive dispensations, could be no other than that of the redemption of mankind by the Messiah, the completion of the whole economy of grace, as it only is the explanation of his first and fundamental promise, that in Abraham should all the families of the earth be blessed. But now, the sole remaining revelation of God’s will to Abraham, recorded by the sacred historian, is the command to offer up his son Isaac. This command then, as there is no other that can pretend to be the revelation in question, and as we have shown it must be somewhere or other recorded in Abraham’s story, is the very revelation we seek, which perfects all the foregoing, and makes the whole series complete and uniform. And the place in which we find it is its proper station, for being the completion of the rest, it must needs be the last in order.” Therefore the design and intent of this learned bishop, is to point out that in this record (the authenticity of which he never for a moment questioned) we find the regular completion and perfection of the whole system of prophecy by typical revelation, which was designed for accomplishing of redemption of mankind by the Messiah. Then he goes on to say (s. 4) “ We must know then that this revelation, as shall be proved from the words of Jesus, “ Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad,” was ardently desired and sought after by the patriarch. Now the happiness or redemption of

“mankind promised, on Abraham’s first vocation, to come through him, could not but make him more and more inquisitive into the manner of its being brought about, in proportion as he found himself to be more and more personally concerned as the instrument of so great a blessing. But every new revelation would show him still farther interested in this honour. Therefore by the time Ishmael was ordered to be sent away, and the promised seed fixed in Isaac, we must needs suppose him very impatient to understand the mystery of redemption, and so fitly prepared to receive this last and supreme revelation. This, in the like cases, we find to be the disposition and state of mind in the holy men of old. Thus Daniel, by the study of the prophecies of Jeremiah, understanding the approaching restoration of the Jews, applies himself by fasting and prayer for God’s further information; and the angel Gabriel is sent unto him. So John, anxious and solicitous for the suffering Church being in prayers on the Lord’s days, was favoured with all his glorious revelations. Again, the new light in which this command is placed, dispels all that perplexity in the common interpretation (taken notice of above) arising from our ideas of a trial; where that which should in use and reason, go before some extraordinary favour is made to come after all. But now, according to our sense of the command, the trial, as is meet, precedes the last and greatest favour ever bestowed by on God Abraham.” (Of course my friend must understand that I am only reading such passages as I think important to my argument, otherwise I must read the whole chapter.) At page 226, he says, “Again, as the high importance of this revelation seemed to require its being given in the strong and forcible way of action, so nothing can be conceived more opposite to convey the information required, than this very action. Abraham desired earnestly to be let into the mystery of the redemption; and God, to instruct him (in the best manner humanity is capable of receiving instruction) in the infinite extent of Divine goodness to mankind, who spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, let Abraham feel, by experience, what it was to lose a beloved son. Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac; the son born miraculously when Sarah was past childbearing, as Jesus was miraculously born of a pure virgin. The duration too, of the action was the same as that between Christ’s death and resurrection, both which were designed to be represented in it, and still farther, not only the final archietypical sacrifice of the son of God was figured in the command to offer Isaac, but the intermediate typical sacrifice, in the Mosaic economy,

was represented, by the permitted sacrifice of the ram offered up instead of Isaiae. The last reason I shall offer in support of this point, that the command concerning Isaiae was this revelation of Christ's day, or the redemption of mankind by his death and sufferings, is the allusion which Jesus makes (in these words, Abraham, rejoiced to see my day, &c.) to the following words of Moses, in the history of the command. And Abraham called the name of that place **Jehovah-jireh**, as it is said to this day. In the Mount of the Lord it shall be seen." Then at page 232, he says, "The sum then of the argument is this—Jesus expressly says that Abraham saw and rejoiced to see his day, or the great sacrifice for the sins of mankind by representation. The records of sacred history must needs verify his assertion. But there is no place in Scripture which presents the least traces of this revelation, except the history of the command to offer Isaiae. This history not only easily and naturally admits of such a sense, but even demands it. And reciprocally, this sense gives all imaginable light to the history, and removes the greatest difficulties attending the common interpretation of it. Hence we conclude with certainty, that the command to Abraham to offer up his son, was only an information in action, which, at Abraham's earnest request, God was graciously pleased to give him of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind. The thing to be proved, two great ends seem to be gained by this interpretation; the one to free the command from a supposed violation of natural law; the other, to support the connexion and dependency between the two revelations, for this interpretation makes the history of the command a direct prophecy of Christ as Reedmer of the world, whereas the common brings it at most but to a typical intimation. Now the defenders of the common interpretation confess that "The evidence of direct prophecies is superior to that of types."

Therefore the object of Bishop Warburton is to strengthen, not to weaken the record, by showing it was not only a prophecy as he admits, and says of course it cannot be questioned as our Lord himself has said so, not only as it is prophesy or a type, but what he pleases to call "An information in action which at Abraham's earnest request, God was graciously pleased to give him, of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind." He is there dealing with plausible objections, and it is not inapposite to observe, that he is answering Collins, one of the infidel writers of that day. And he says, at page 238, "Nay, I might go further, and say that this is not the only place where the true reason of the com-

mand is plainly hinted at. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of this very command, says, By faith, Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac, accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure ΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ in a parable, a mode of information either by words or actions, which consists in putting one thing for another. Now, in a writer who regarded this commanded action as a representative information of the redemption of mankind, nothing could be more fine or easy than this expression. For though Abraham did not indeed receive Isaac restored to life after a real dissolution, yet the son being in this action to represent Christ suffering death for the sins of the world, when the father brought him safe from Mount Moriah, after three days (during which the son was in a state of condemnation to death), the father plainly received him under the character of Christ's representative as restored from the dead. For as his being brought to the Mount, there bound, and laid upon the altar, figured the death and sufferings of Christ, so his being taken from thence alive, as properly figured Christ's resurrection from the dead. With the highest propriety, therefore, and elegance of speech might Abraham be said to receive Isaac from the dead, in a parable or in representation. But the nature of the command not being understood, these words of the Epistle have been hitherto interpreted, to signify only that Isaac was a type of Christ, in the same sense that the old Tabernacle, in this epistle, is called a type *γραμμή ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ*, that is a thing designed by Holy Spirit, to have both a present signification and a future.

At page 243 he says, “However I desire it may be observed in corroboration of my sense of the command that the resemblance to Christ's sacrifice in all the circumstances of the story was so strong, that interpreters could never overlook the resemblance in their comments on the passage.” Then, at page 247, this is the second part of the section; what does that begin with? I come now to the other part of this discourse; what is the object of that? “To show that the interpretation here given entirely dissipates all those blustering objections which infidelity hath raised up against the historic truth of the relation.”

My lord, in confirmation of what I said to you yesterday, viz., that the writers in this book shine by reflected light, very often a light from the old Deists of England, you will find, in page 268, a passage which Warburton cites from *Lord Shaftesbury's Characteristics*—Lord Shaftesbury was an avowed Deist. The passage contains precisely the same heresy as is

to be found in this essay. “To me,” says the noble writer, “it plainly appears, that in the early times of all religions, when nations were yet barbarous and savage, there was ever an aptness or tendency towards the dark part of superstition, which, amongst many other horrors, produced that of human sacrifice. Something of this nature might possibly be deduced even from *Holy Writ*.” To this a note refers, in the following words: “Gen., xxii., 1, and Judges, xi., 30. These places, relating to Abraham and Jephthah, are cited only with respect to the notion which these primitive warriors may be said to have entertained concerning this horrid enormity, so common amongst the inhabitants of Palestine and other neighbouring nations. It appears that even the elder of these Hebrew princes was under no extreme surprise on this trying revelation. Nor did he think of expostulating, in the least, on this occasion, when at another time he could be so importunate for the pardon of an inhospitable, murderous, impious, and incestuous city. Gen., xviii., 23.” (That is taken from *Lord Shaftesbury’s Characteristics*, vol. iii., page 124.) Bishop Warburton, who is cited as an authority for this heresy, writes the whole second part of this discourse to disprove “those blustering objections,” these are his words, “which infidelity hath raised up against the historie truth of the relation.” That is the only authority which is cited to cover the offence of this passage in the *Essay* of Dr. Williams, and I leave it with great confidence in your lordship’s hands.

I must also call your lordship’s attention, as my friend referred to it, to a pamphlet by Dr. Jelf, entitled *Specific Evidence of Unsoundness in the Volume entitled Essays and Reviews.*” My lord, Dr. Jelf is the very learned and accomplished clerk who, in the lower house of Convocation moved the condemnation to these essays and reviews. I forgot to mention, in the history of the case, that this book of *Essays and Reviews* had been presented by the lower house of Convocation to the upper house. At page 30 of this pamphlet, in section 5, entitled the *Heretical Parody of Holy Writ*, he puts on one side extracts from Dr. Williams’s article, and on the other side he puts the passages from the Bible to which they refer. In the same page is a note, to which I wish to draw your lordship’s attention. “Thinking it possible that the writer of the second essay might be simply quoting the author whom he was reviewing, I had recourse to the original, of which I subjoin a translation:—‘In him (Abraham) we see before us the high, noble mind, which, after long internal struggles, first broke the slavery and curse of the bloody man-murdering,

child-murdering service of Moloch, and that because he thought more highly of God's immediate voice in conscience and reason, than of all the tradition of his kindred (Stammengenossen). It was on the strength of this faith in the unerring voice of God in man, that he rejected the bloody custom, and introduced the saving symbol of circumcision.' " That is from Buusen's *Gott in der Geschichte* (1857), p. 160.

I therefore leave this eleventh Article with perfect conviction upon one point, viz., that it will be impossible to reconcile the passages it charges heretical to the formularies of the Church of England by any fair mode of construction whatever. I shall say no more upon the subject. I shall leave this argument to the consideration of the Court.

Now I come to the twelfth article, which charges two passages at pages 81, 87. We have taken two separate passages, and from those two passages we have inferred that Dr. Williams " did advisedly maintain and affirm that Christ did not suffer, nor was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, nor to be a sacrifice for the original guilt, as well as for the actual sins of men. That the offering of Christ is not the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." That is what we say is the fair construction of the passages we have set forth. Now, to that, first of all, great objection is taken. It is said, " you have taken two passages separated from each other by an interval of six pages." That is unquestionably true; we say is contained the following passages at pages 81 and 87. Your lordship must recollect that this is a review, and it is not only a review, but a review by a person who writes a very loose, slipshod style, and who scatters his opinions up and down the whole of the article. Now, then, the fair test of whether we were authorized in separating the two portions is this: if we had begun at page 81, and transcribed all the pages from 81 to 87 (the book itself, the whole volume, as I have already said, being appended to the articles), we should then have come exactly to the same conclusion to which we have now come in the charging part of our articles; only we should have included in it a great many other things besides those which we have made the subjects of separate charges. I should have no objection, I am sure, except that it would be a waste of type and paper to have all the pages copied out from page 81 to page 87, and then the charging part would remain exactly as it is now. It is not as if the intervening part offered any fair explanation which would take away the gist of the charge against Dr. Williams.

I submit that is not the case: that, of course, is a question of construction for the Court. I submit it is not the case. It stands as a definite proposition at page 81. "Propitiation would be the recovery of that peace, which cannot be while sin divides us from the Searcher of Hearts." We might have omitted that, except that we thought it right to connect the two together as containing the same idea; we might have stood altogether upon the passage in page 87 without reference to page 81, for page 87 contains this (I must speak plainly) most offensive passage, "Salvation from evil through sharing the Saviour's spirit, was shifted into a notion of purchase from God, through the price of his bodily pangs; the deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual." My lord, at page 80 of this book, at the first paragraph, your lordship will find the passage which my friend read. It begins thus:—"This recognition of Christ as the moral Saviour of mankind may seem to some Baron Bunsen's most obvious claim to the name of Christian." Now, first, I ask the Court what is the plain meaning of the words above by themselves? Can any one accustomed to an honest and ingenuous construction of opinions, spoken or written, doubt that it is intended distinctly to deny that salvation from evil was a purchase from God at the price of our Saviour's bodily pangs? Can anybody doubt that the bodily sufferings of our Saviour are there denied as having anything to do with our salvation? And can any one reconcile that with the awful language of the litany on this point? Can any one doubt that this passage strikes at the root of a doctrine so mysterious and awful, that one is reluctant to refer to it in a legal proceeding, even in an Ecclesiastical Court? Can any one doubt that it strikes at the root of the doctrine of the sufferings of our Lord having purchased our redemption? And what is the meaning of the words, "the deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual." What is "a commercial transfer?" What can be the meaning of these words but the plain and simple meaning, that the bodily sufferings of our Lord, and the act of the resurrection, are to be "spiritualized," if they like to call it so—"idealized," I believe, is the cant term—are to be "idealized" and "allegorized" away with all the other facts of our Lord's history? That is a theory taken from the German Strauss, in the very book my friend referred to (only that he had regard to the "terminology," as they call it, of Scripture), and he eventually resolved all the facts of the resurrection into mythical appear-

ances, only intended to convey a spiritual lesson. “ The deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual.”

Now, having addressed your lordship upon what is the plain meaning of the words, I ask the Court to look at the defence which is offered. The defence is that he was intending to reprobate the Roman Catholic superstition. The attempt is to open a door of escape from this clear disavowal of Christian doctrine, under the miserable pretext of a “ No Popery !” cry. Now, my lord, is there a word in the book itself about the Roman Catholic religion having led to this? Is there a syllable? Is there a note in the many editions of this work which has undertaken to offer this explanation? I ask, then, is it competent to a clergyman of the Church of England to express himself in language which can bear but one import to any plain man, and reserve for his defence in Court an ingenious solution which is not to be found in his work, nay, is at variance with the whole context of it; and which refers apparently to a subject with which it has no connexion? Your lordship will remember that at this stage I, who appear for the prosecution, must always, to a certain extent, labour under an embarrassment, because I am not now arguing the case as if I was calling for judgment on the defendant. I am arguing merely upon the admissibility of the articles. I therefore do not say what amount of sentence the Court might think fit to pass upon the defendant for this offence, but that it is a subject for ecclesiastical censure in the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury I can entertain no doubt whatever. Your lordship will see that the passages we have selected from Scripture, with which we say it is at variance. I would rather not at this moment enter into such an inquiry more minutely.

Now I come to the thirteenth article. Dr. Williams says, “ The first Christians held that the heart was purified by faith; the accompanying symbol, water, became by degrees the instrument of purification. Holy baptism was at first preceded by a vow, in which the young soldier expressed his consciousness of spiritual truth; but when it became twisted into a false analogy with circumcision, the rite degenerated into a magical form, and the Augustinian notion of a curse inherited by infants, was developed in connexion with it.” Well, we thought that most plainly there was here “ advisedly maintained and affirmed that the element of water is not a divinely ordained means whereby we receive the spiritual grace in the sacrament of baptism.” We thought it was

most strongly to the thirty-seventh Article of Religion, and that part of the Church Catechism which we have set out, which contain among other passages, this, “A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.” Now the doctrine of the catechism must certainly be taken to be this: “For being by nature born in sin, we are hereby made the children of grace.” That is the doctrine of the Catechism. Is that doctrine to be found, or I should rather say, is not that doctrine attacked in the passage before read. What is the meaning of saying “The first Christians held that the heart was purified by faith; the accompanying symbol, water, became by degrees the instrument of purification? What is the meaning of sin? Holy baptism was at first preceded by a vow, in which the young soldier expressed his consciousness of spiritual truth; but when it became twisted into a false analogy with circumcision, the rite degenerated into a magical form, and the Augustinian notion of a curse inherited by infants, was developed in connexion with it.” Could the writer have doubted for a moment that he was *prima facie* at least opposing the plain language of the Catechism? What is the suggestion on his behalf? That he is referring to a particular doctrine of St. Augustine, with reference to the condemnation of infants who had died unbaptized. Where is there the slightest reference to it? Where is there the slightest allusion to it? If that be so, surely a clergyman of the Church of England is bound not so to express himself as to convey a totally different meaning to every plain man who reads his book, and to reserve himself for such a defence as that. I am not disputing now as to St. Augustine’s doctrine. My friend, Mr. Coleridge, will look into that matter. I have not had time to do so; I have no doubt my friend quoted the passage correctly. I do not know whether the result of that passage is that the teaching of St. Augustine was so; I have always understood that St. Augustine held some doctrine about a Limbus for infants, but perhaps I am wrong as to that. I say this is an explanation which should be found in the work itself, if it applies at all; and it is not so to be found there. As to the notion of defending it by the Gorham case, with reference to the Augustinian notion of a curse being inherited by infants dying unbaptized, or any particular notion of that kind, it is altogether a strained, unnatural, and improper construction of the passage. If Dr. Williams meant to say so, he either ought to have said it before, or he ought to be called

upon now to say so. I confess myself I should have a great curiosity to know if Dr. Williams were ordered to put in plain language a defence of this, whether he would say. “ I declare that when I used these words, I meant to say that by nature people were born in sin, and the children of wrath. I meant to say they became the children of grace by baptism, but I meant to say that St. Augustine was wrong when he said that children dying unbaptized were condemned.” I do not believe he would say that. I do not think so ill of Dr. Williams as to think he would say so. It is perfectly lawful for his advocate to use the argument, perfectly proper that he should do so; it shows the many resources his talent and ingenuity furnish him with, but I am bound to say that I cannot bring myself to believe that in writing that passage, any such intention was in the mind of Dr. Williams.

I come to the next article, which is, perhaps, one of the most serious in the whole catalogue. Dr. Williams says, “ Thus the incarnation becomes with our author as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul, the Son of David by birth is the Son of God by the spirit of holiness.” And we say that herein “ he did advisedly maintain and affirm that the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ was purely spiritual, and that the Son of God did not take man’s nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, or that he did therein advisedly maintain and affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport and effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the second of the said Articles of Religion.” My learned friend says, “ Here we are articed for using the language of St. Paul, and he refers to what St. Paul says in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. i., verse 3, and he read the words. I would ask the Court to fix its eye on the passage we have selected when I read the words of Scripture. Dr. Williams says, “ The incarnation becomes with our author as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul, the Son of David by birth is the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness.” What does St. Paul say? “ Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness.” And there my learned friend stopped; unless I was mistaken, and unless he has been misrepresented by the shorthand writer, he never in any part of his argument read the words which follow, viz., “ According to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.”

My lord, it does not, of course, require to be a very profound

theologian to see that this addition alters entirely the whole argument. Whereas, in the passage before you, a supernatural truth is resolved into a sort of moral process. Dr. Williams's words might be used with perfect propriety of any religious Christian living. The whole Incarnation, as a fact, is "idealized" in the passage before you; whereas, St. Paul emphatically points to the Resurrection as a declaration of our Lord's divinity to the world. With St. Paul the doctrine was not, as is stated here, purely spiritual, moral, ideal, and imaginary—it was a supernatural and Divine fact; and I press this strongly upon your lordship, because, though I cannot profess any great acquaintance with German modes or habits of thinking, still I believe the root of the whole mischief lies there. It is the object of these writers to get rid of the facts with which the truths of the Gospel are connected, and to substitute for them ideas and speculations; and in this passage it is perfectly clear to my mind, and must be so to any one who compares it with the Apostle's language, that in the one case the Incarnation is spoken of as a spiritual or ideal matter, and in the other it is spoken of as a supernatural Divine fact, and the Resurrection itself is adduced as a proof of it. Again I say, my lord, with regard to this and all the other passages on these awful and mysterious subjects, that no clergyman is at liberty to write with such levity and carelessness; that what he says is, apparently at least, contradictory of the Formularies of the Church of England and the whole teaching of the Bible; and then, when he is brought into a Court of Justice, to suggest, for the first time, a method by which the obvious meaning of the words may be pared away.

I come now to the fifteenth article, and here I am relieved from a great deal of difficulty, because, as your lordship has so very recently given a judgment upon the main subject, which is here set forth, I do not think it will be necessary for me to seek to do more than refer your lordship to the judgment in *Burder v. Heath*, which (as it is appealed from) I must do under protest. My lord, I have a sort of recollection of an elaborate argument on the subject of justification by faith, and I have a sort of recollection of the entire discomfiture of that argument in the judgment in *Burder v. Heath*; so that I think it will be very difficult not to admit this article on the part of the judge who gave that judgment. The article sets forth this passage: "For though he embraces, with more than orthodox warmth, New Testament terms, he explains them in such a way that he may be charged with using evangelical language

in a philosophical sense. But in reply, he would ask, what proof is there that the reasonable sense of St. Paul's words was not the one which the Apostle intended. Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? St. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility as opposed to sacerdotalism; or that to obey, is better than sacrifice. Faith would be opposed, not to the good deeds which conscience requires, but to works of appeasement by ritual justification; would be neither an arbitrary ground of confidence, nor a reward upon condition of our disclaiming merit, but rather a verdict of forgiveness of our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts."

The charge is that here "justification by faith means only the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, and that justification is a verdict of forgiveness upon our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts."

Now, my lord, the question of the author here is, "why may not justification by faith have meant peace of mind, or sense of the Divine approval?" The answer to that is, that he says it did, but the eleventh article of religion says it did not, and you subscribe the articles. That is the simple answer. It is perfectly clear that this is entirely opposed to the spirit and language of the eleventh article of religion, more opposed, if I may venture to say so, than the language of Mr. Heath, was to the same article.

I now come to the sixteenth article, which I have already discussed in the few words which I addressed to the Court at the opening of my speech. Perhaps, none of the passages set forth are more offensive, perhaps none show the recklessness of the writer more than the passage with which we begin this last extract. "So when he asks," (that is, Baron Bunsen) "How long shall we bear this fiction of an external revelation, that is, of one violating the heart and conscience instead of expressing itself through them, or when he says, 'All this is delusion for those who believe it but what is it in the mouths of those who teach it?' Or, when he exclaims, 'Oh! the fools; who, if they do see the immense perils of this age, think to ward them off by narrow-minded persecution,' and when he repeats, 'Is it not time in truth, to withdraw the veil from our misery? to tear off the mask from hypocrisy, and destroy that sham which is undermining all real ground under

our feet? To point out the dangers which surround, nay threaten already to engulf us,' there will be some who think his language too vehement for good taste. Others will think burning words needed by the disease of our time."

I do not wish to repeat again what I have said upon this point, I have reflected upon it, and I do not think I expressed myself in language at all too strong. I have not the smallest wish to retract a word I said upon that point, therefore, I leave that article with the observations I have already made upon it, and I have no doubt whatever, that if that passage stood alone, any Ecclesiastical Court would find itself bound to censure the presumptuous, flippant, irreverent, and indecent writer or eiter of those words.

My lord, I do not again refer to the concluding doggrel verses which conclude the essay. I come to the seventeenth article, and that is neither more nor less than a summary of all the charges which we have drawn as is usual in articles of this description, and as far as I know a correct summary, and one tending to draw the attention of the accused, and the notice of the Court to the principal offences with which he is charged. Again, as to the lawfulness of pleading a "tendency, scope, object, and design," I repeat that such pleading is perfectly lawful in a case of this description. My lord, I again say, that many works may be conceived published by a clergyman, the "tendency, scope, object, and design," of which would obviously be to bring very great scandal upon the Church; and to bring very great scandal upon the Church is an acknowledged ecclesiastical offence, and subjects the person who does it to ecclesiastical censure.

My lord, these are the observations, which supported by those of my learned friends who follow me, I have to make to your lordship upon the admissibility of these criminal articles against Dr. Williams.

In conclusion—words even more welcome to myself than to your lordship—I thus briefly sum up my argument for the admissibility of these criminal articles. They are ranged under two principal heads; first, those which relate to the great subject of the authority and inspiration of "God's Word written," to use the expressive language of the twentieth of our Thirty-nine Articles. Secondly, those which relate to the Cardinal catholic doctrines of the Church of Christ. We contend that, though the Church has wisely not defined inspiration, it has most certainly and clearly excluded that sense of it, which would bring down the Bible to the level of a poem written by Milton, or a sermon composed by Luther;

that the Church, while leaving full liberty to her ordained ministers to criticize the text, and examine the history of Holy Writ, has not conceded to them the license of denying, according to the fancy of each particular minister, all the historical facts of the Bible, with the truth of which all the great doctrines of our salvation, all that gives dignity to the life and hope to the death of a Christian, are inextricably and for ever bound up. These are the principal positions which we maintain ; the legal soundness or unsoundness of them is now submitted to the rude, but necessary criterion of the admissibility of these criminal articles in the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is said, that these positions are the result of vulgar clamour, and will destroy the liberty which we profess to give, and strip the Church of its learning. Among those who raise this vulgar clamour are the whole Episcopate of England, and nearly ten thousand of the clergy, whose petition I now hold in my hand. The threat is idle, the alarm ridiculous. Within the liberties of our present formularies have arisen the mightiest intellects of England, the greatest masters of thinking and of writing that have adorned the literature of this or any other country in Christendom. The vaunted learning in the particular instance of this essay consists in a revival of the exploded heresies and discarded trash of the early heretics, and the later deists. It is a plagiarism of a plagiarism, the borrowed infidelity of a particular school of German writers, who have adopted, often with distinct acknowledgment, the once happily forgotten blasphemies of the English deists. But, my lord, if the threat were real, and the alarm well founded, if it were as true, as we know it experimentally to be false, that the Church would thus be stripped of her learning—better, I do not hesitate to say, what is called by some, an “unlearned” than what is known by all to be a dishonest church—better, a thousand times better—at any risk of religious convulsions, by new legislation to sweep away the articles, canons, and formularies of our Church than to suffer them to remain—corrupting alike the faith and the morals of the people, both clergy and laity—while the most solemn obligations, and the plainest engagements incurred by subscription to these formularies are permitted to be explained away by the most most dishonest subterfuges, and the most palpable sophistry.

END OF SPEECH.

APPENDIX.

In the Arches Court of Canterbury.

THE OFFICE OF THE JUDGE PROMOTED BY THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY AGAINST WIL- LIAMS.

IN the Name of God, Amen. We, Stephen Lushington, Doctor of Laws, Official Principal of the Arches Court of Canterbury, lawfully constituted, do by virtue of our office, at the voluntary promotion of the Right Reverend Father in God, Walter Kerr, by divine permission, Bishop of Salisbury, object, article, and administer to you, the Reverend Rowland Williams, Doctor in Divinity, a Clerk in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and Vicar of the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalk, with the Chapel of Burr Chalk, otherwise Bower Chalk, in the County of Wilts, in the Diocese of Salisbury and Province of Canterbury, all and singular the articles, heads, positions, or interrogatories hereunder written or hereafter mentioned, touching and concerning your soul's health, and the lawful correction and reformation of your manners and excesses, and more especially for having within the said Diocese of Salisbury and elsewhere, within the said Province of Canterbury, offended against the Laws Ecclesiastical of this Realm, by having, within the last two years, written, printed, published, dispersed, and set forth in a Book entitled "Essays and Reviews," a certain Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, entitled, "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," and by having, in such Article, or Essay, or Review, and in the notes thereto, advisedly maintained and affirmed certain erroneous, strange, and heretical doctrines, positions, and opinions, con-

trary and repugnant to the doctrine and teaching of the said United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established, and thereby contravening the statutes, constitutions, and canons ecclesiastical of the realm, and against the peace and unity of the Church as follows, to wit:—

First. We article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that by the laws, statutes, constitutions, and canons ecclesiastical of the realm, all ecclesiastical persons, of what rank or condition soever, who have been admitted into Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, ought to adhere to and maintain with constancy and sincerity, the doctrine and teaching of the Church; and that whosoever after having been so admitted, and having subscribed and declared his assent to the Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishop and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord 1562, and ratified by Royal Authority, shall revolt from, or impugn, or promulgate doctrines or positions contrary to, or inconsistent with, the said Articles, or any of them, or any of the doctrines therein contained, or shall utter, publish, promulgate, or declare anything contrary to, or in derogation of, the doctrine and teaching of the said Church, as contained and set forth in the book entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be said or sung in Churches, and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," ought to be punished and corrected according to the gravity of his offence and the exigency of the law. And we article and object of everything in this and the subsequent Articles contained jointly and severally.

Second. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that for many years last past, you have been, and now are, a Clerk in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and were, in the year 1859, rightfully and lawfully presented, instituted, and inducted in and to the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalk, with the Chapels of Burr Chalk and Alveston, otherwise Bower Chalk and Alverdiston, in the County of Wilts, in the Diocese of Salisbury, and Province of Canterbury, and for and as the lawful Vicar of the said Parish and Chapels, you

were from such your institution, until the said Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, was, to wit, in the month of April, in the present year, 1861, by an Order of Her Majesty in Council, made in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, passed in the first and second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, intituled, "An Act to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better provisions for the residence of the Clergy," constituted a separate benefice, commonly accounted, reputed, and taken to be, and have been, ever since the separation of the said Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, and now are Vicar of the said Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalk, with the Chapel of Burr Chalk, otherwise Bower Chalk, and have since been and now are commonly accounted, reputed, and taken to be. And we article and object of any other time, parish, ordination, presentation, institution, induction, benefice, or promotion, as shall appear from the lawful proofs to be made in this Cause. And we article and object as before.

Third. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, in supply of proof of the premises in the next preceding article mentioned, and to all other intents and purposes in the law whatsoever, and do exhibit and hereto annex two certain paper writings, marked with the letters A and B, and will that the same be received and taken as part and parcel hereof, and as if herein read and inserted, and do allege and propound the said paper writing A to be and contain a true and authentic copy of the act of institution of you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, in and to the said Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalk, with the Chapels of Burr Chalk and Alveston, otherwise Bower Chalk and Alverdiston; and the said paper writing, marked B, to be and contain a true copy of the said original Order in Council. That the said paper writings have been faithfully extracted from the principal Registry of the said Bishop of Salisbury, at the city of Salisbury, where the original Act of Institution of you, the Reverend Rowland Williams, and the said original Order in Council (duly registered pursuant to the provisions of the said Act of Parliament) now remain, and have been carefully collated, with the original entry of your Institution, and with the said original Order in Council, and severally agree therewith, and which copies are duly certified by Fitzherbert Macdonald, the Registrar of the said Bishop of Salisbury. That Rowland Williams, Clerk, D.D., mentioned in the said Exhibits A and B, and you, the Reverend Rowland

Williams, Doctor in Divinity, articed against in this Cause, were, and are, one and the same person, and not divers: and that the Vicarage of Broad Chalk, with the Chapels of Burr Chalk and Alveston, otherwise Bower Chalk and Alverdiston, in the County of Wilts, in the Diocese of Salisbury, and Province of Canterbury, mentioned in the said Exhibits A and B; and the Vicarage of Broad Chalk, with the Chapels of Burr Chalk and Alveston, otherwise Bower Chalk and Alverdiston, in the next preceding Article mentioned, was, and is, one and the same ecclesiastical living, benefice, or promotion, and not divers. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Fourth. Also, we article and object to you the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that notwithstanding the premises in the foregoing Articles pleaded, you did within the last two years, write, print, publish, disperse, give and sell, or cause to be written, printed, published, dispersed, given and sold within the said Diocese of Salisbury, and elsewhere, within the said Province of Canterbury, in a book entitled "Essays and Reviews," a certain Article, or Essay or Review, with divers notes thereto, entitled "Bunsen's Biblical Researches, by Rowland Williams, D.D., Vice Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Lampeter, Vicar of Broad Chalk, Wilts," the said Article, Essay, or Review, commencing at the 50th page of the said book, and continuing from that to the 93rd page inclusive. And we article and object as before.

Fifth. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that by your order, or with your consent, by way of preface or introduction to the said book, entitled, "Essays and Reviews," it is printed as follows:—

"To the Reader, "It will be understood that the Authors of the ensuing Essays are responsible for their respective Articles only. They have written in entire independance of each other, and without concert or comparison. The volume, it is hoped, will be received as an attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment."

Also, we article and object to you, that the said book has, with your knowledge and consent, passed through nine editions,

and that no other preface or introduction than the aforesaid one has been prefixed thereto, or printed or published. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Sixth. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that the said articulate Essay or Review, entitled, "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," has not, during the nine editions aforesaid, undergone any, or at least any material or substantial alteration, but, is in all of them, exactly or almost exactly in the very same words as it was when first published by you, or by your order, in the first edition. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Seventh. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams that in the said Article, Essay, or Review, are contained the following passages, that is to say:—at pages 60 and 61.

"As in his *Egypt* our author sifts the historical date of the Bible, so in his *Gott in der Geschichte*, he expounds its directly religious element. Lamenting, like Pascal, the wretchedness of our feverish being, when estranged from its eternal stay, he traces, as a countryman of Hegel, the Divine thought bringing order out of confusion. Unlike the despairing school, who forbid us trust in God or in conscience, unless we kill our souls with literalism, he finds salvation for men and States only in becoming acquainted with the Author of our life, by whose reason the world stands fast, whose stamp we bear in our forethought, and whose voice our conscience echoes. In the Bible, as an expression of devout reason, and therefore to be read with reason in freedom, he finds record of the spiritual giants whose experience generated the religious atmosphere we breathe."

at pages 82 and 83.

"If we would estimate the truth of such views, the full import of which hardly lies on the surface, we find two lines of inquiry present themselves as criteria: and each of these divides itself into two branches. First, as regards the subject matter, both spiritual affection and metaphysical reasoning forbid us to confine revelations like those of Christ to the first half century of our era, but show at least affinities of our faith existing in men's minds, anterior to Christianity, and renewed with deep echo from living hearts in many a generation.

Again, on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustration in outward act of principles perpetually true; but not adequate to guarantee narratives inherently incredible, or precepts evidently wrong. Hence we are obliged to assume in ourselves a verifying faculty, not unlike the discretion which a mathematician would use in weighing a treatise on geometry, or the liberty which a musician would reserve in reporting a law of harmony. Thus, as we are expressly told, we are to have the witness in ourselves. It is not our part to dictate to Almighty God, that He ought to have spared us this strain upon our consciences; nor in giving us through His Son a deeper revelation of His own presence, was He bound to accompany His gift by a special form of record. Hence there is no antecedent necessity that the least rational view of the gospel should be the truest, or that our faith should have no human element, and its records be exempt from historical law. Rather we may argue, the more Divine the germ, the more human must be the development."

at pages 77 and 78.

" But, if such a notion alarms those who think that, apart from omniscience belonging to the Jews, the proper conclusion of reason is atheism; it is not inconsistent with the idea that Almighty God has been pleased to educate men and nations, employing imagination no less than conscience, and suffering His lessons to play freely within the limits of humanity and its shortcomings. Nor will any fair reader rise from the prophetic disquisitions, without feeling that he has been under the guidance of a master's hand. The great result is to vindicate the work of the Eternal Spirit; that abiding influence, which as our church teaches us in the Ordination Service, underlies all others, and in which converge all images of old time and means of grace now; temple, Scripture, finger, and hand of God; and again, preaching, sacraments, waters which comfort, and flame which burns. If such a Spirit did not dwell in the Church the Bible would not be inspired, for the Bible is, before all things, the written voice of the congregation. Bold as such a theory of inspiration may sound, it was the earliest creed of the Church, and it is the only one to which the facts of Scripture answer. The Sacred Writers acknowledge themselves men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which dwelt

in them. Hence, when we find our Prayer-book constructed on the idea of the Church being an inspired society, instead of objecting that every one of us is fallible, we should define inspiration consistently with the facts of Scripture, and of human nature. These would neither exclude the idea of fallibility among Israelites of old, nor teach us to quench the Spirit in true hearts for ever. But if any one prefers thinking the Sacred Writers passionless machines, and calling Luther and Milton “uninspired,” let him co-operate in researches by which his theory, if true, will be triumphantly confirmed.”

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passages hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, that the Bible or Holy Scripture is an expression of devout reason, and the written voice of the congregation, not the Word of God, nor containing any special revelation of His truth, or of His dealings with mankind, nor the rule of our faith ; or that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm doctrines, positions, or opinions to that, or the like purport and effect, and that the said doctrines, positions, or opinions are contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 6th, 7th, and 20th of the said articles of religion, and contrary to and inconsistent with that part of the Nicene Creed, which declares in substance, that the Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets ; and contrary to and inconsistent with the teaching of the said Church, as contained in that portion of Holy Scripture, appointed in the said Book of Common Prayer, to be read as the Epistle for Christmas Day, which is in the words and figures following, to wit :—“ *The Epistle*, Hebrews i. 1.—GOD, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds ; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had, by himself, purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high ; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee ? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son ? And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a

flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." And as contained in that portion of the Holy Scripture, appointed in the said Book of common Prayer to be read us the Epistle for the Epiphany, which is in the words and figures following, to wit:—" *The Epistle.* Ephesians iii. 1. —FOR this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles; if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to youward: How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit; That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ, by the Gospel: whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent, that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him." And as contained in the proper preface appointed in the said Book of Common Prayer, upon Whit-Sunday and six days afterwards, which is in the words and figures following, to wit;—" *Upon Whit-Sunday, and six days after.*—THROUGH Jesus Christ our Lord; according to whose most true promise, the Holy Ghost came down as at this time from heaven with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them, and to lead them to all truth: giving them both the

gift of divers languages, and also boldness with fervent zeal constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations ; whereby we have been brought out of darkness and error into the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ. Therefore with angels, &c." And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Eighth. And we further article and object to you the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said Article, Essay, or Review, are contained the following passages, to wit, at pages 65, 66, and 67, are contained the following passages, and notes thereto.

" In our own country each successive defence of the prophecies, in proportion as its author was able, detracted something from the extent of literal prognostication ; and either laid stress on the moral element, or urged a second, as the spiritual sense. Even Butler foresaw the possibility, that every prophecy in the Old Testament might have its elucidation in contemporaneous history ; but literature was not his strong point, and he turned aside, endeavouring to limit it, from an unwelcome idea. Bishop Chandler is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic ; others restricted this character to five. Paley ventures to quote only one. Bishop Kidder² conceded freely an historical sense in Old Testament texts remote from adaptations in the New. The apostolie Middleton pronounced firmly for the same principle ; Archbischop Newcome³ and others proved in detail its necessity. Coleridge, in a suggestive letter, preserved in the memoirs of Carey, the translator of Dante, threw secular prognostication altogether out of the idea of prophecy.¹ Dr. Arnold, and his truest followers,

" 2 Collected in the *Boyle Lectures*.

" 3 *A Literal Translation of the Prophets, from Isaiah to Malachi*, with Notes, by Lowth, Blayney, Newcome, Wintle, Horsley, &c. London. 1836. A book unequal, but useful for want of a better, and of which a revision, if not an entire recast, with the aid of recent expositors, might employ our Biblical scholars.

" 1 ' Of prophecies in the sense of *prognostication* I utterly deny that there is any instance delivered by one of the illustrious Diadoche, whom the Jewish church comprised in the name *Prophets*—and I shall regard *Cyrus* as an exception, when I believe the 137th Psalm to have been composed by David.

" ' Nay, I will go farther, and assert that the contrary belief, the hypo-

bear, not always consistently, on the same side. On the other hand, the declamatory assertions, so easy in pulpits or on platforms, and aided sometimes by powers, which produce silence rather than conviction, have not only kept alive but magnified with uncritical exaggeration, whatever the Fathers had dreamt or modern rhetoric could add, tending to make prophecy miraenlous. Keith's edition of Newton need not be here discussed. Davison, of Oriel, with admirable skill, threw his argument into a series as it were of hypothetical syllogisms, with only the defect (which some readers overlook) that his minor premise can hardly in a single instance be proved. Yet the stress which he lays on the moral element of prophecy atones for his sophistry as regards the predictive. On the whole, even in England, there is a wide gulf between the arguments of our genuine critics, with the convictions of our most learned clergy, on the one side, and the assumptions of popular declamation on the other. This may be seen, on a comparison of Kidder with Keith. But in Germany there has been a pathway streaming with light, from Eichhorn to Ewald, aided by the poetical penetration of Herder and the philological researches of Gesenius, throughout which the value of the moral element in prophecy has been progressively raised, and that of the directly predictive, whether secular or Messianic, has been lowered."

at pages 67, and 68.

"To this inheritance of opinion Baron Bunsen succeeds. Knowing these things and writing for men who know them, he has neither the advantage in argument of unique knowledge, nor of unique ignorance."

at pages 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74,

"He may read the Psalm xxxiv., that 'not a bone of the righteous shall be broken,' but he must feel a difficulty in detaching this from the context, so as to make it a prophecy of the crucifixion. If he accepts mere versions of Psalm xxii. 17, he may wonder how 'piercing the hands and the feet' can fit into the whole passage; but if he prefers the most ancient Hebrew writing, he finds, instead of 'piercing,' the com-

thesis of prognostication, is an irreconcileable oppugnancy to our Lord's declaration, that the *times* hath the Father reserved to Himself"—*Memoir of Carey*, vol. ii. p. 180."

parison ‘like a lion,’ and this corresponds sufficiently with the ‘dogs’ of the first clause ; though a morally certain emendation would make the parallel more perfect by reading the word ‘lions’ in both clauses. In either case, the staring monsters are intended, by whom Israel is surrounded and torn. Again he finds in Hosea that the Lord loved Israel when he was young, and called him out of Egypt to be his son ; but he must feel, with Bishop Kidder, that such a citation is rather accommodated to the flight of Joseph into Egypt, than a prediction to be a ground of argument. Fresh from the services of Christmas, he may sincerely exclaim, *Unto us a child is born* ; but he knows that the Hebrew translated *Mighty God*, is at least disputable, that perhaps it means only Strong and Mighty One, Father of an Age ; and he can never listen to any one who pretends that the maiden’s child of Isaiah vii. 16, was not to be born in the reign of Ahaz, as a sign against the Kings Pekah and Resin. In the case of Daniel, he may doubt whether all parts of the book are of one age, or what is the starting point of the seventy weeks ; but two results are clear beyond fair doubt, that the period of weeks ended in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that those portions of the book, supposed to be specially predictive, are a history of past occurrences up to that reign. When so vast an induction on the destructive side has been gone through, it avails little that some passages may be doubtful, one perhaps in Zechariah, and one in Isaiah, capable of being made directly Messianic, and a chapter possibly in Deuteronomy foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem. Even these few cases, the remnant of so much confident rhetoric, tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry. If our German had ignored all that the masters of philology have proved on these subjects, his countrymen would have raised a storm of ridicule, at which he must have drowned himself in the Neckar.

“ Great then is Baron Bunsen’s merit, in accepting frankly the belief of scholars, and yet not despairing of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God. The way of doing so left open to him, was to show, pervading the Prophets, these deep truths which lie at the heart of Christianity, and to trace the growth of such ideas, the belief in a righteous God, and the nearness of man to God, the power of prayer, and the victory of self-sacrificing patience, ever expanding in men’s hearts, until the fulness of time came, and the ideal of the Divine thought was fulfilled in the Son of Man. Such accordingly is the course our author pursues, not with the

critical finish of Ewald, but with large moral grasp. Why he should add to his moral and metaphysical basis of prophecy, a notion of foresight by vision of particulars, or a kind of *clairvoyance*, though he admits it to be a natural gift, consistent with fallibility, is not so easy to explain. One would wish he might have intended only the power of seeing the ideal in the actual, or of tracing the Divine Government in the movements of men. He seems to mean more than presentiment or sagacity ; and this element in his system requires proof.

“ The most brilliant portion of the prophetical essays is the treatment of the later Isaiah. With the insertion of four chapters concerning Hezekiah from the histories of the kings, the words and deeds of the elder Isaiah apparently close. It does not follow that all the prophecies arranged earlier in the book are from his lips ; probably they are not ; but it is clear to demonstration, that the later chapters (xl., &c.) are upon the stooping of Nebo, and the bowing down of Babylon, when the Lord took out of the hand of Jerusalem the cup of trembling ; for the glad tidings of the decree of return were heard upon the mountains ; and the people went forth, not with haste, or flight, for their God went before them, and was their rereward (ch. lii.). So they went forth with joy, and were led forth with peace (ch. liv.). So the arm of the Lord was laid bare, and his servant who had foretold it was now counted wise, though none had believed his report. We cannot take a portion out of this continuous song, and by dividing it as a chapter, separate its primary meaning from what precedes and follows. The servant in chapters lii. and liii. must have relation to the servant in chapters xlvi. and xlix. Who was this servant, that had foretold the exile and the return, and had been a man of grief, rejected of his people, imprisoned and treated as a malefactor ? The oldest Jewish tradition, preserved in Origen, and to be inferred from Justin, said the chosen people—in opposition to heathen oppressors—an opinion which suits ch. xlix., ver. 3. Nor is the later exposition of the Targum altogether at variance ; for though Jonathan speaks of the Messiah, it is in the character of a Judaic deliverer : and his expressions about ‘*the holy people’s being multiplied*,’ and seeing their sanctuary rebuilt, especially when he calls the holy people a *remnant*, may be fragments of a tradition older than his time. It is idle, with Pearson, to quote Jonathan as a witness to the Christian interpretation, unless his conception of the Messiah were ours. But the idea of the Anointed One,

which in some of the Psalms belongs to Israel, shifted from time to time, being applied now to people, and now to king or prophet, until at length it assumed a sterner form, as the Jewish spirit was hardened by persecutions into a more vindictive hope. The first Jewish expositor who loosened, without breaking Rabbinical fetters, R. Saadiah, in the 9th century, named Jeremiah as the man of grief, and emphatically the prophet of the return, rejected of his people. Grotius, with his usual sagacity, divined the same clue; though Michaelis says upon it, *pessimè Grotius*. Baron Bunsen puts together, with masterly analysis, the illustrative passages of Jeremiah; and it is difficult to resist the conclusion to which they tend. Jeremiah compares his whole people to sheep going astray, and himself to 'a lamb or an ox, brought to the slaughter.' He was taken from prison; and his generation, or posterity, none took account of; he interceded for his people in prayer: but was not the less despised, and a man of grief, so that no sorrow was like his; men assigned his grave with the wicked, and his tomb with the oppressors; all who followed him seemed cut off out of the land of the living, yet his seed prolonged their days; his prophecy was fulfilled, and the arm of the Eternal laid bare; he was counted wise on the return; his place in the book of Sirach shows how eminently he was enshrined in men's thoughts as the servant of God; and in the book of Maccabees he is the gray prophet, who is seen in vision, fulfilling his task of interceding for the people.

“ This is an imperfect sketch, but may lead readers to consider the arguments for applying Isaiah lii. and liii. to Jeremiah. Their weight (in the master's hands) is so great, that if any single person should be selected, they prove Jeremiah should be the one. Nor are they a slight illustration of the historical sense of that famous chapter, which in the original is a history. Still the general analogy of the Old Testament which makes collective Israel, or the prophetic remnant, especially the servant of Jehovah, and the comparison of ch. xlii., xlix. may permit us to think the oldest interpretation the truest; with only this admission, that the figure of Jeremiah stood forth amongst the Prophets, and tinged the delineation of the true Israel, that is, *the faithful remnant* who had been disbelieved—just as the figure of Laud or Hammond might represent the Caroline Church in the eyes of her poet.

“ If this seems but a compromise, it may be justified by

Ewald's phrase, '*Die wenigen Treuen im Exile, Jeremjah und Andre*,' though he makes the servant idealized Israel."

" If any sincere Christian now asks, is not then our Saviour spoken of in Isaiah? let him open his New Testament, and ask therewith John the Baptist, whether he was Elias? If he finds the Baptist answering *I am not*, yet our Lord testifies that in spirit and power this was Elias; a little reflexion will show how the historical representation in Isaiah liii. is of some suffering prophet or remnant, yet the truth and patience, the grief and triumph, have their highest fulfilment in Him who said, 'Father, not my will, but thine.' But we must not distort the prophets, to prove the Divine WORD incarnate, and then from the incarnation reason back to the sense of prophecy."

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain or affirm, that in the books of the Old Testament, there is, with the possible exception of one, two, or three doubtful passages, no element of divinely inspired prediction or prognostication of future persons or events; or that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm, such a doctrine, position, or opinion, and that the same is contrary to, and inconsistent with, the 6th and 7th of the said Articles of Religion, and that portion of the Nicene Creed which declares in substance that the Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets, and contrary to, and inconsistent with, the teaching of the said Church as contained in that portion of the Holy Scripture appointed in the said book of Common Prayer, to be read as the Gospel for the Monday in Easter week, which is in the words and figures following, to wit:—" *The Gospel.* St. Luke xxiv. 13.—BEHOLD, two of his disciples went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, that while they communed together, and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden, that they should not know him. And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of them, whose name was Cleophas, answering, said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass therein these days? And he said

unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word, before God and all the people: And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and besides all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; and when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not. Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. And they drew nigh unto the village whither they went; and he made as though he would have gone further; but they constrained him, saying, Abide with us, for it is towards evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread." And as contained in those portions of Holy Scripture appointed in the said Book of Common Prayer to be read as the Epistle and Gospel for the Tuesday in Easter Week, in the words and figures following, to wit:—" *For the Epistle.* Acts xiii, 26. MEN and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent. For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him. And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took

him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead: and he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another Psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but he whom God raised again saw no corruption. Be it known unto to you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.

“ *The Gospel.* St. Luke xxiv. 36. JESUS himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled, and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them. And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his Name among

all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things." And as contained in those portions of Holy Scripture appointed in the said Book of Common Prayer to be read as the Gospel for Good Friday, as the Gospel for the First Sunday after Christmas, as the first proper Lesson for the Morning Service on Christmas Day, as the first proper Lesson for the Evening service on Christmas Day, as the proper Lessons on the Sundays of Advent, and the Sundays after Epiphany, and as the first proper Lesson for the Evening Service of Good Friday. And this was and is true, and article and object as before.

Ninth. And we further article and object to you, the Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said Article, Essay, or Review, are contained the following passages, that is to say at pages 76 and 77:—

“ In distinguishing the man Daniel from our book of Daniel, and in bringing the latter as low as the reign of Epiphanes, our author only follows the admitted necessities of the case.”

“ The truth seems, that starting like many a patriot bard of our own, from a name traditionally sacred, the writer used it with no deceptive intention, as a dramatic form which dignified his encouragement of his countrymen in their great struggle against Antiochus. The original place of the book, amongst the later Hagiographa of the Jewish canon, and the absence of any mention of it by the son of Sirach, strikingly confirm this view of its origin; and if some obscurity rests upon details, the general conclusion, that the book contains no predictions, except by analogy and type, can hardly be gainsaid. But it may not the less, with some of the latest Psalms, have nerved the men of Israel, when they turned to flight the armies of the aliens; and it suggests, in the godless invader, no slight forecast of Caligula again invading the Temple with like abomination, as well as of whatever exalts itself against faith and conscience, to the end of the world. It is time for divines to recognize these things, since, with their opportunities of study, the current error is as discreditable to them, as for the well-meaning crowd, who are taught to identify it with their creed, it is a matter of grave compassion.

“ It provokes a smile on serious topics to observe the zeal with which our critic vindicates the personality of Jonah, and the originality of his hymn (the latter being generally thought

doubtful), while he proceeds to explain that the narrative of our book, in which the hymn is imbedded, contains a late legend, founded on misconception. One can imagine the cheers which the opening of such an essay might evoke in some of our own circles, changing into indignation as the distinguished foreigner developed his views. After this he might speak more gently of mythical theories."

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passages hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, That the Prophet Jonah was not a real historical person, and that the canonical Book, written by him and incorporated in the Old Testament, was not really written by him, and has not any authority binding upon the Church, and that the Book of Daniel was not the work of the Prophet Daniel, but of some other person, and is not an authority binding on the Church, or that you did therein advisedly maintain or affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport or effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 6th of the said Articles of Religion, and contrary to, or inconsistent with, the teaching of the said church, as contained in the form and manner of making Deacons in the following question and answer, to wit : "The Bishop,—Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ? Answer,—I do believe them." And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Tenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said article, Essay or Review, is contained the following passage, that is to say, at pages 83, 84, 85, and a note, numbered (3), at the foot of page 84.

" Our author then believes St. Paul, because he understands him reasonably. Nor does his acceptance of Christ's redemption from evil bind him to repeat traditional fictions about our canon, or to read its pages with that dulness which turns symbol and poetry into materialism. On the side of history lies the strength of his genius. His treatment of the New Testament is not very unlike the acute criticism of De Wette, tempered by the affectionateness of Neander. He finds in the first three gospels divergent forms of the tradition, once oral, and perhaps catechetical, in the congregations of the apostles.

He thus explains the numerous traces characteristic of a traditional narrative. He does not ascribe the quadruple division of record to the four churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, on the same principle as liturgical families are traced; but he requires time enough for some development, and for the passing of some symbol into story. By making the fourth gospel the latest of all our genuine books, he accounts for its style (so much more Greek than the Apocalypse), and explains many passages. The verse, ‘And no man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down,’ is intelligible as a free comment near the end of the first century; but has no meaning in our Lord’s mouth at a time when the ascension had not been heard of. So the Apocalypse, if taken as a series of poetical visions, which represent the outpouring of the vials of wrath upon the city where the Lord was slain, ceases to be a riddle. Its horizon answers to that of Jerusalem already threatened by the legions of Vespasian, and its language is partly adapted from the older prophets, partly a repetition of our Lord’s warnings as described by the Evangelists, or as deepened into wilder threatenings in the mouth of the later Jesus, the son of Ananus. The epistle to the Hebrews, so different in its conception of faith, and in its Alexandrine rhythm, from the doctrine and the language of St. Paul’s known Epistles, has its degree of discrepancy explained by ascribing it to some³ companion of the apostles; and minute reasons are found for fixing with probability on Apollos. The second of the Petrine Epistles, having alike external and internal evidence against its genuineness, is necessarily surrendered as a whole; and our critic’s good faith in this respect is more certain than the ingenuity with which he reconstructs a part of it. The second chapter may not improbably be a quotation; but its quoter, and the author of the rest of the epistle, need not therefore have been St. Peter.”

And we artie and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being a portion of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, the doctrine, position, or opinion, that the portion of Holy Scripture usually called the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the Epistle usually called the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle usually called the Epistle of St. Peter, are not respectively parts of Holy Scrip-

“³ In my own judgment, the Epistle bears traces of being *post-apostolic.* ii. 3; iii. 14; x. 25-32; xiii. 7, 8.”

ture, whose authority is binding upon the Church, or that you did therein advisedly maintain or affirm, a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport or effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 6th of said Articles of Religion, and contrary to, or inconsistent with, the teaching of the said Church, as contained in the portion of Holy Scripture appointed by the said Book of Common Prayer, to be read for the Epistle on All Saints day ; and in the words and figures following, to wit :—“ *For the Epistle.* Revelations vii. 2. And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God ; and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth, and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads. And I heard the number of them which were sealed ; and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand, of all the tribes of the children of Israel. Of the tribe of Judah were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Reuben were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Gad were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Aser were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Neptali were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Manasses were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Simeon were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Levi were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Issachar were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Zabulon were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Joseph were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Benjamin were sealed twelve thousand. After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands ; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders, and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen ; Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen.” and contrary to, or inconsistent with, the teaching of the said church, as contained in the form and manner of making deacons, in the following question and answer, to wit :—“ The Bishop—Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ? Answer—I do believe them.” And this was and is true, and we artie and object as before.

Eleventh. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said Article, Essay, or Review, are contained the following passages, that is to say, at pages 56, 59, and 61,

“ Our deluge takes its place among geological phenomena, no longer a disturbance of law from which science shrinks, but a prolonged play of the forces of fire and water, rendering the primeval regions of North Asia uninhabitable, and urging the nations to new abodes. We learn approximately its antiquity, and infer limitation in its range, from finding it recorded in the traditions of Iran and Palestine (or of Japhet and Shem), but unknown to the Egyptians and Mongolians, who left earlier the cradle of mankind. In the half ideal half traditional notices of the beginnings of our race, compiled in Genesis, we are bid notice the combination of documents, and the recurrence of barely consistent genealogies.”

“ Baron Bunsen notices the ‘high hand’ with which Jehovah led forth his people, the spoiling of the Egyptians, and the lingering in the peninsula, as signs, even in the Bible, of a struggle conducted by human means. Thus, as the pestilence of the Book of Kings becomes in Chronicles the more visible angel, so the avenger who slew the firstborn may have been the Bedouin host, akin nearly to Jethro, and more remotely to Israel.

“ So in the passage of the Red Sea, the description may be interpreted with the latitude of poetry: though as it is not affirmed that Pharaoh was drowned, it is no serious objection that Egyptian authorities continue the reign of Menepithah later. A greater difficulty is that we find but three centuries thus left us from the Exodus to Solomon’s Temple. Yet less stress will be laid on this by whoever notices how the numbers in the Book of Judges proceed by the eastern round number of forty, what traces the whole book bears of embodying history in its most popular form, and how naturally St. Paul or St. Stephen would speak after received accounts.”

“ When the fierce ritual of Syria, with the awe of a divine voice, bade Abraham slay his son, he did not reflect that he had no perfect theory of the absolute to justify him in departing from traditional revelation, but trusted that the FATHER, whose voice from heaven he heard at heart, was better pleased with mercy than with sacrifice; and his trust was his right-

consciousness. Its seed was sown from heaven, but it grew in the soil of an honest and good heart. So in each case we trace principles of reason and right, to which our heart perpetually responds, and our response to which is a truer sign of faith than such deference to a supposed external authority as would quench these principles themselves.” And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passages hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm that the statements of Holy Scripture as to historical facts may be read and understood in a wholly figurative sense, and in a non-natural sense, of the plain words and purport thereof, or that you did therein advisedly maintain or affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport or effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 6th and 7th of the said articles of the Church, and contrary to and inconsistent with the teaching of the said Church, as contained in that portion of Holy Scripture appointed by the Book of Common Prayer as the proper lesson for the Evening Service for the First Sunday in Lent, to wit,—the 22nd cap. of the First Book of Moses, called Genesis, and to that portion of Holy Scripture appointed by the Book of Common Prayer as the second proper lesson for the Morning Service on All Saints Day, to wit,—from verse 33 of the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to the 7th verse of 12th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and contrary to or inconsistent with the teaching of the said Church, as contained in the form and manner of making Deacons, in the following question and answer, to wit, “The Bishop,—Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament? Answer,—I do believe them.” And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Twelfth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams that in the said article, Essay or Review, is contained the following passages at pages 81 and 87, “Propitiation would be the recovery of that Peace, which cannot be, while Sin divides us from the Searcher of Hearts.”

“Salvation from evil through sharing the Saviour’s spirit, was shifted into a notion of purchase from God, through the price of his bodily pangs. The deep drama of heart and mind became externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual.”

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Row-

land Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said article Essay or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, that Christ did not suffer, nor was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, nor to be a sacrifice for the original guilt, as well as for the actual sins of men. That the offering of Christ is not the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; or that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion to that, or the like purport and effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary to or inconsistent with the 2nd and 31st of the said Articles of Religion, and contrary to and inconsistent with the teaching of the said Church, as contained in the Prayer of Consecration in the order of administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, which is in the words following, to wit:—“ ¶ *When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.* ALMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who,

* *Here the Priest is to take in the same night that he was betrayed,* the Puten into his hands:*

† *And here to break the Bread:*

‡ *And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread:*

|| *Here he is to take the Cup into his hands:*

§ *And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flayon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.*

ing, Drink ye all of this; for this § is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. *Amen.*” And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Thirteenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said article, Essay, or Review, is contained the following passage, at page 86. “The first Christians held that the heart was purified by faith ; the accompanying symbol, water, became by degrees the instrument of purification. Holy Baptism was at first preceeded by a vow, in which the young soldier expressed his consciousness of spiritual truth ; but when it became twisted into a false analogy with circumcision, the rite degenerated into a magical form, and the Augustinian notion of a curse inherited by infants, was developed in connexion with it.”

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being portions of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, that the element of water is not a divinely ordained means whereby we receive the spiritual grace in the Sacrament of Baptism, or that you did advisedly maintain and affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport or effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 27th of the said articles of religion, and is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the teaching of the said Church, as contained in the following passages of the Church Catechism, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, to wit :—*Question.*—“HOW many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church? *Answer.*—Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. *Question.*—What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*? *Answer.*—I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. *Question.*—How many parts are there in a Saerament? *Answer.*—Two ; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace. *Question.*—What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism? *Answer.*—Water ; wherein the person is baptized *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* *Question.*—What is the inward and spiritual grace? *Answer.*—A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness : for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.” And that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm, that St. Augustine falsely introduced the notion of original sin attaching to every person born into this world, and deserving God’s wrath and damnation, or that you did therein advisedly main-

tain and affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport and effect, such doctrine, position, or opinion, being contrary to, and inconsistent with, the 9th of the said Articles of Religion, and contrary to, and inconsistent with, the teaching of the said Church, as contained in the "Ministratior of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church." And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Fourteenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said Article, Essay, or Review, is contained the following passage at page 82. "Thus the incarnation becomes with our Author as purely spiritual as it was with St. Paul, the Son of David by birth, is the Son of God by the Spirit of holiness." And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being a portion of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, that the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ was purely spiritual, and that the Son of God did not take man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, or that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport and effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 2nd of the said articles of religion. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Fifteenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the said article, Essay or Review, is contained the following passage, at pages 80, 81, in the words following, to wit, "For though he embraces with more than orthodox warmth, New Testament terms, he explains them in such a way that he may be charged with using evangelical language, in a philosophical sense. But in reply, he would ask, what proof is there that the reasonable sense of St. Paul's words was not the one which the Apostle intended? Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? St. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility, as opposed to sacerdotalism; or, that to obey, is better than sacrifice. Faith would be opposed, not to the good deeds which conscience requires, but to works of appeasement by ritual justification, would be neither an arbitrary ground of confidence, nor a reward upon condition of

our disclaiming merit, but rather a verdict of forgiveness upon our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts."

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in the passage hereinbefore recited, being portion of the said article, Essay or Review, you did advisedly maintain and affirm, that Justification by Faith means only the peace of mind, or sense of Divine approval, which comes of trust in a righteous God, and that justification is a verdict of forgiveness upon our repentance, and of acceptance upon the offering of our hearts ; or, that you did therein advisedly maintain and affirm, a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that or the like purport or effect, and that such doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the 11th of the said Articles of Religion. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Sixteenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that the said Article, Essay, or Review, concludes with the following passages, at p. 92 and 93.

"So, when he asks : 'How long we shall bear this fiction of an external revelation,'—that is, of one violating the heart and conscience, instead of expressing itself through them—or when he says, 'All this is delusion for those who believe it ; but what is it in the mouths of those who teach it ?'—or when he exclaims, 'Oh the fools ! who, if they do see the imminent perils of this age, think to ward them off by narrow-minded persecution !' and when he repeats, 'Is it not time, in truth, to withdraw the veil from our misery ? to tear off the mask from hypocrisy, and destroy that sham which is undermining all real ground under our feet ? to point out the dangers which surround, nay, threaten already to engulf us ?—there will be some who think his language too vehement for good taste. Others will think burning words needed by the disease of our time. These will not quarrel on points of taste with a man who in our darkest perplexity has reared again the banner of truth, and uttered thoughts which give courage to the weak, and sight to the blind. If Protestant Europe is to escape those shadows of the twelfth century, which with ominous recurrence are closing around us, to Baron Bunsen will belong a foremost place among the champions of light and right. Any points disputable or partially erroneous, which

may be discovered in his many works, are as dust in the balance, compared with the mass of solid learning, and the elevating influence of a noble and Christian spirit. Those who have assailed his doubtful points are equally opposed to his strong ones. Our own testimony is, where we have been best able to follow him, we have generally found most reason to agree with him. But our little survey has not traversed his vast field, nor our plummet sounded his depth."

“ Bunsen, with voice, like sound of trumpet born,
Conscious of strength, and confidently bold,
Well feign the sons of Loyola the scorn
Which from thy books would scare their startled fold—
To thee our Earth disclosed her purple morn,
And time his long-lost centuries unrolled ;
Far Realms unveiled the mystery of their Tongue :
Thou all their garlands on the Cross hast hung.

“ My lips but ill could frame thy Lutheran speech,
Nor suits thy Teuton vaunt our British pride—
But ah ! not dead my soul to giant reach,
That envious Eld’s vast interval defied ;
And when those fables strange, our hirelings teach,
I saw by genuine learning cast aside,
Even like Linnaeus kneeling on the sod,
For faith from falsehood severed, thank I GOD.”

And we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that in and by the passage hereinbefore recited, being a portion of the said Article, Essay, or Review, you did advisedly approve of and adopt, and express your adherence to, and assent in the substance of all the said Article, Essay, or Review, as well as those parts and words, of which other persons were the original writers, as those written by yourself. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Seventeenth. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that the manifest tendency, scope, object, and design, of the whole Essay, is to inculcate a disbelief in the Divine Inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, contained in the Old and New Testament, to reduce the said Holy Scriptures to the level of a mere human composition, such as the writings of Luther and of Milton ; to deny that the Old Testament contains prophecies

or predictions of Our Saviour, and other persons and events ; to deny that the Prophets speaking under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, foretold human events ; to deny altogether or greatly discredit, the truth and genuineness of the historical portions of the Old Testament, and the truth and genuineness of certain parts of the New Testament, and the truth and reality of the miracles recorded as facts in the Old and New Testament ; to deny or interpret by a meaning at variance with that of the Church, the Doctrines of Original Sin of Infant Baptism, of Justification by Faith, Atonement, and Propitiation by the death of our Saviour, and of the Incarnation of our Saviour. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Eighteenth. In part supply of proof of the premises in this and the preceding articles pleaded, and to all other intents and purposes in the law whatsoever, we exhibit hereto, annex, and will, that the same be taken and read, as if herein inserted a printed copy of the said book entitled, " Essays and Reviews," in which is contained the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, entitled, " Bunsen's Biblical Researches," marked in the title page thereof with the letter C. And this was and is true, and we article and object of every other matter or thing in the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto contained, and as before.

Nineteenth. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that you have several times, or at least once, admitted and declared that you were the Author of the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, entitled, " Bunsen's Biblical Researches," contained in the said book, entitled, " Essays and Reviews," in the preceding articles pleaded, and that you had caused the same to be printed, published, dispersed, and set forth within the said Diocese of Salisbury, and elsewhere within the said Province of Canterbury. And we further article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that one or more of such printed copies of the said book, containing the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, have been sent or presented by you, or by your order or direction, and as the Author of the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, within the said Diocese of Salisbury, and elsewhere within the said Province of Canterbury. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Twentieth. Also, we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that you were and are an ecclesiastical person, and have an ecclesiastical living and preferment, to wit,—the Vicarage of Broad Chalk, with the chapel of Burr Chalk, otherwise Bower Chalk, in the county of Wilts, in the Diocese of Salisbury and Province of Canterbury, and that there was and is a scandal and evil report in the said Diocese and elsewhere in the said Province, concerning you, the Reverend Rowland Williams, as having been, and being an offender against the laws ecclesiastical of this realm, by having, within the last two years, written, printed, published, dispersed, and set forth, or caused to be printed, published, dispersed, and set forth, in the said book, entitled, "Essays and Reviews, the said Article, or Essay, or Review, with divers notes thereto, entitled, "Bunsen's Biblical Researches," in several of the preceding articles pleaded, and for having, in such Article, or Essay, or Review, and in the notes thereto, advisedly maintained and affirmed certain erroneous, strange, and heretical doctrines, positions, and opinions, contrary and repugnant to the doctrine and teaching of the said United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established, and thereby contravening the statutes, constitutions, and canons ecclesiastical of the realm, and against the peace and unity of the church, and that by reason thereof, and of a certain act or statute made in the parliament holden at Westminster in the 3rd and 4th years of the reign of Her present Majesty, Queen Victoria, entitled, "An Act for better enforcing Church Discipline," and of the Letters of Request under the hand and seal of the said Bishop of the Diocese of Salisbury, presented and accepted in this Cause, you were and are subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Twenty-first. Also we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that it hath been and is, on the part and behalf of the said Bishop of Salisbury, the voluntary Promoter of our office in this cause, rightly and duly complained to us, the Judge aforesaid, and to this Court. And this was and is true, and we article and object as before.

Twenty-second. Also we article and object to you, the said Reverend Rowland Williams, that all and singular the premises were and are true, public, and notorious, and thereof there was, and is, a public voice, fame and report, of which

legal proof being made to us the Judge aforesaid, and to this Court, we will that you, the Reverend Rowland Williams, be duly and canonically corrected and punished, according to the gravity of your offence, and the exigency of the law, and also condemned in the costs made, and to be made, on the part and behalf of the said Bishop of Salisbury, the Promoter of our office in this Cause, and compelled to the due payment thereof, by our definitive sentence or final Interlocutory Decree, to be read and promulgated, made and interposed in this Cause. And that it be further done and observed in the premises, as to right and justice shall appertain in this behalf, the benefit of the law being always preserved.

JOSEPH PHILLIMORE,
M. C. M. SWABEY.

A.

Extracted from the Registry of the Lord Bishop of Sarum.

1859.

Broad Chalk, with Bower Chalk, and Alverdiston Chapels.	Vicarage.	Institution.
------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	--------------

On the 29th day of January, in the year aforesaid, at Sarum, the said Right Reverend Father, did admit and canonically institute Rowland Williams, Clerk, D.D. in and to the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalk, with the Chapels of Burr Chalk and Alveston, otherwise Bower Chalk and Alverdiston, in the County of Wilts, and Diocese of Sarum, void by the death of Stephen Hernard Hawtrey, Clerk, the last Incumbent thereof, on the presentation of the Reverend Richard Okes, Doctor in Divinity, Provost of the King's College of Blessed Mary and Saint Nicholas, of Cambridge, and the Scholars of the same College, the true and undoubted Patrons in full right of the said Vicarage, (as it is asserted) and did invest him with all the rights, &c., having first taken the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy Simony and Canonical obedience, and subscribed the Articles,

&c., and did commit unto him the cure &c., and mandate issued to the Archdeacon of Sarum for his induction, as is the custom.

FITZ. MACDONALD.
Registrar.

B.

Extracted from the Registry of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

At the Court at Osborne House, Isle of Wight, the 16th day of April, 1861.

L.S. Present—The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

WHEREAS by an Act passed in the first Session of the Parliament, holden in the first and second years of the Reign of Her present Majesty, intituled "An Act to abridge the holding of Benefices and Plurality, and to make better provision for the residence of the Clergy." After reciting that "Whereas in some instances Tithings, Hamlets, Chapelries, and other Places or Districts, may be separated from the Parishes or Mother Churches to which they belong with great advantage, and places altogether extra-parochial, may in some instances, with advantage be annexed to Parishes or Districts to which they are contiguous, or be constituted separate Parishes for Ecclesiastical purposes." It is amongst other things enacted "Then when with respect to his own Diocese, it shall appear to the Archbishop of the Province, or when the Bishop of any Diocese shall represent to the said Archbishop, that any such Tithing, Hamlet, Chapelry, Place or District, within the Diocese of such Archbishop, or the Diocese of such Bishop as the case may be, may be advantageously separated from any Parish or Mother Church, and either be constituted a separate Benefice by itself, or be united to any other Parish to which it may be more conveniently annexed, or to any other adjoining Tithing, Hamlet, Chapelry, Place or District, Parochial or extra-Parochial, so as to form a separate Parish or Benefice, or that any extra-Parochial place may with advantage be annexed to any Parish to which it is contiguous, or be con-

stituted a separate Parish for Ecclesiastical purposes. And the said Archbishop or Bishop shall draw up a scheme in writing (the scheme of such Bishop to be transmitted to the said Archbishop for his consideration), describing the mode in which it appears to him that the alteration may best be effected, and how the changes consequent on such alteration, in respect to Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, Glebe Land, Tithes, Rent charges, and other Ecclesiastical dues, rates, and payments, and in respect to patronage and rights to pews, may be made with justice to all parties interested, and if the patron or patrons of the Benefice or Benefices to be effected by such alteration, shall consent in writing under his or their hands to such scheme, or to such modification thereof as the said Archbishop may approve; and the said Archbishop shall, on full consideration and enquiry, be satisfied with any such scheme or modification thereof, and shall certify the same, and such consent as aforesaid by his report to Her Majesty in Council, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council to make an order for carrying such scheme or modification thereof, as the case may be, into effect."

And whereas by another Act of Parliament, passed in the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, intituled "An Act to make better provision for the assignment of Ecclesiastical Districts to Churches or Chapels, augmented by the Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne, and for other purposes." It is amongst other things further enacted "That when, by any order of Her Majesty in Council as aforesaid, a separate Parish, for Ecclesiastical purposes is constituted, the same, shall, on registration thereof, and with the consent in writing of the incumbent or incumbents of the Benefice or Benefices to be thereby affected, become a Perpetual Curacy or Benefice, and the Minister thereof duly nominated and licensed thereto, and his successors shall be a Body Politic, and corporate with perpetual succession, and may receive and take to himself and his successors, all such lands, tenements, tithes, rent charges, and hereditaments, as shall be granted unto him or them, and such Perpetual Curate shall thenceforth have within the limits of the District Parish, formed under the Church Building Acts for the Church of such Perpetual Curacy, sole and exclusive cure of souls, and shall not in anywise be subject to the control or interference of the incumbent or incumbents of the Benefice or Benefices to be affected by such order, if he or they shall have consented to such order as aforesaid, but, if such incumbent or incumbents shall not have

so consented thereto, this last mentioned provision shall not come into operation, until the next avoidance of the Benefice by the incumbent objecting thereto, or by the surviving incumbent objecting, if more than one shall object thereto, and in such case the last-mentioned provision shall forthwith after such avoidance come into operation, and shall be binding on all persons whatsoever."

And whereas, the Lord Bishop of the Diocese of Salisbury, hath drawn up together with a scheme, a representation in writing, bearing date the 9th day of July, 1860, and hath transmitted the same to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in the words and figures following, that is to say:—

“ To the Most Reverend John Bird,
Lord Archbishop of the Province of Canterbury.”

“ I, the Right Reverend Walter Kerr, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, to represent to your Grace, that to the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalke belong two ancient Parochial Chapelries, namely,—Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke, and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, all in the County of Wilts and my Diocese of Salisbury, the limits and boundaries whereof are well known and defined.”

“ That according to the Census of 1851, the population of the said parish of Broad Chalke, with the Parochial Chapelry of Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke, annexed (exclusive of the Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston;) is 1330, and the population of the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, is 278.

That the annual value of the Vicarage of Broad Chalke with Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke aforesaid (exclusive of what arises within the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, and exclusive of the annual value of the Vicarage house and appurtenances at Broad Chalke aforesaid, amounts to the sum of £311 or thereabouts; arising from Glebe and Tithe-rent charge, namely, in respect of Glebe, the sum of £71, and in respect of Tithe rent charge the sum of £240, and that the annual income derivable from the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, amounts to the sum of £82 2s., arising from Glebe and Tithe rent charge, namely, in respect of Glebe, the sum of two

pounds, two shillings, and in respect of Tithe rent charge, the sum of £80.

That the said Parochial Chapelry of Alverston, otherwise Alvediston, is separated from the parish of Broad Chalke, by the Parochial Chapelries of Ebbesborne and Burr Chalke, alias Bower Chalke aforesaid, and from the Parochial Chapelry of Burr, alias Bower Chalke, by Ebbesborne, and is distant from the said parish of Broad Chalke, at the nearest point, four and a quarter miles, and from the said Parochial Chapelry of Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke, three and half miles, and that the inhabitants of the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, are distant from the said parish church of Broad Chalke, by the nearest roadway, five miles.

That there is a chapel in the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston otherwise Alverdiston, kept in good repair by the inhabitants of the said Parochial Chapelry, and that it is capable of affording sufficient accommodation to the said inhabitants, who from time immemorial have resorted to the said Chapel, and have elected from amongst themselves exclusively, Chapelwardens, as if the same were a distinct and separate Benefice.

“ That Baptisms, Churchings, Marriages, and Burials, have heretofore been, and are now, performed in the said Chapel, and the Burial Ground thereto belonging.

“ That the patronage of the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalke aforesaid, with the said Parochial Chapelries of Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke, and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, is vested in the Provost of the King’s College of Blessed Mary, and Saint Nicholas of Cambridge, and the scholars of the same College.

“ That the Rectorial Tithe of the said Vicarage of Broad Chalke is now legally vested in the said Provost and scholars, patrons as aforesaid, who purpose on the separation of the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, to endow the proposed separate Benefice with the annual sum or rent of sixteen pounds, to be charged upon the said Rectorial Tithe.

“ That the Reverend Rowland Williams, D.D. is now the Vicar thereof.

“ That the Vicarage of Broad Chalke, with Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke, and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, is discharged from the payment of first fruits and tenths.

“ That it appears to me, that under the provisions of the Act of Parliament, of the first and second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, cap. 106, and of the second and third years of the same reign, cap. 49, the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, may be advantageously separated from the said Vicarage and Parish of Broad Chalke, and be constituted a separate Benefice for Ecclesiastical purposes.

“ That pursuant to the direction contained in the twenty-sixth section of the first mentioned Act, I have prepared the following Scheme, which, together with the consent thereto of the Patron and Incumbent of the said Vicarage, I do submit to your Grace, to the intent that your Grace may, if, on full consideration and enquiry, you shall be satisfied with such scheme, certify the same and such consent to Her Majesty in Council.

The Scheme above referred to.

“ That the said ancient Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, shall be separated from the said Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalke, and be constituted a separate Benefice by the name or style of “ The Perpetual Curaey of Alverdiston.”

“ That such new Benefice, shall be subject to the same Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction as the said Vicarage of Broad Chalke, and the Incumbent thereof, shall have exclusive cure of souls within the limits of the same respectively.

“ That all so much, and such part of the Tithe rent charges, or other payments, or compositions, for, or in lieu, of Tithes belonging to the said Vicarage of Broad Chalke, as arise and accrue, or are, or may be, payable within, or in respect of, the said Parochial Chapelry of Alverdiston, and also

the produce of the Glebe Lands within, and belonging to, the said Parochial Chapelry of Alverdiston; and also all the surplus fees for Baptisms, Marriages, Churchings, and Burials, or other Ecclesiastical offices solemnized or performed within the same parish, and all dues, offerings, and other emoluments, arising within, or in respect of, the same Parochial Chapelry of Alverdiston, and usually payable to an Incumbent of a Benefice, shall respectively belong, and be attached to the said proposed new Benefice of Alverdiston for ever, and be held, received, and enjoyed, by the Perpetual Curate, for the time being thereof accordingly.

“ That the patronage or right of nominating Ministers to said proposed new Benefice of Alverdiston, shall be and be vested in the Vicar of Broad Chalke for the time being.

“ That the inhabitants of the said Parochial Chapelry of Alverdiston, shall continue and be liable to the repairs and maintenance of the Chapel of their own Parish, and shall not be liable to contribute to the repairs and maintenance of the Parish Church of Broad Chalke, nor any Church or Chapel, now or hereafter built elsewhere than within the limits of such Parochial Chapelry, nor shall the inhabitants of the same Parish be entitled as inhabitants to any pews or sittings within the said Mother Church of Broad Chalke.”

Given under my hand this 9th day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1860.

(Signed) W. K. SARUM.

Consent above referred to.

We, the Right Worshipful Richard Okes, Doctor in Divinity, Provost of the King's College of Blessed Mary and Saint Nicholas of Cambridge, and the Scholars of the same College, the Patrons of the said Vicarage of Broad Chalke, with Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, and the Reverend Rowland Williams. Doctor in Divinity, the Vicar thereof, do hereby

signify our consent to the scheme above proposed for separating the said ancient Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, from the said Vicarage and Parish, or Mother Church of Broad Chalke, and constituting such Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, a separate Benefice and Perpetual Curacy. In witness whereof, we, the said Provost and Scholars, have hereunto set the common seal of our said College, and I, the said Rowland Williams, have set my hand and seal this 3rd day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1860.

(Signed) ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D.
Vicar of Broad Chalke, with Bower Chalke,
and Alverdiston. L.S.

And whereas His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury hath, pursuant to the provisions of the said Acts, duly prepared and laid before Her Majesty in Council, a certificate and report in writing, bearing date the 4th day of January, 1861, in the words and figures following, that is to say:—

“ To the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

“ We, the undersigned, John Bird, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, do hereby certify unto your Majesty in Council, that we have received a representation, with a scheme, in writing, under the hand of the Right Reverend Walter Kerr, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, bearing date the 9th day of July last, and hereto annexed, stating amongst other things, that to the Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalke, belong two ancient Parochial Chapelries, namely, Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, all in the County of Wilts, and Diocese of Salisbury, the limits and boundaries whereof are well known and defined. And that it appeared to his Lordship the said Parochial Chapelry of Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, might be advantageously separated from the said Vicarage and Parish Church of Broad Chalke, and be constituted a separate Benefice for Ecclesiastical purposes, by the name or style of the Perpetual Curacy of Alverdiston,” as in the said representation and scheme is more fully set forth. And the consent in writing of the Right Worshipful Richard Okes, D.D., Provost of the King’s College of Blessed Mary and Saint Nicholas of Cambridge,

and the Scholars of the same College, the Patrons of the said Vicarage of Broad Chalke, with Burr Chalke, otherwise Bower Chalke and Alveston, otherwise Alverdiston, under the common seal of the said College, and the consent of the Reverend Rowland Williams, D.D., the Vicar thereof, under his hand, is also annexed. And we, the said Archbishop, being on full consideration and enquiry, satisfied with such scheme do certify the same, and the consents aforesaid, under the provisions of the Act of Parliament, made and passed in the Session of Parliament, held in the first and second years of your Majesty's reign, intituled, "an Act to abridge the holding of Benefices in plurality, and to make better provision for the residence of the clergy," and also another Act of Parliament, made and passed in the Session of Parliament, held in the second and third years of your Majesty's reign, intituled, "An Act to make better provision for the assignment of Ecclesiastical Districts to Churches or Chapels, augmented by the Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne, and for other purposes," to the intent that your Majesty in Council, may, in case your Majesty in Council shall think fit so to do, make and issue an order for carrying the said scheme into effect, declaring that the patronage or right of nomination to the said proposed new Benefice of Alverdiston, shall be vested in the Vicar of Broad Chalke for the time being. As witness our hand this 10th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1861.

(Signed) J. B. CANTUAR.


Now therefore, Her Majesty in Council, by and with the advice of Her said Council, is pleased to approve of the said scheme of the said Bishop of Salisbury, and to order, and it is hereby ordered that the same be carried into effect.

ARTHUR HELPS.

FITZ MACDONALD, Registrar.

THE END.

F. Shoberl, Printer, 37, Dean Street, Soho, W.





THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.



DP GUTHRIE, READER



AA 000 979 638 4

